

**Bond University**

## **DOCTORAL THESIS**

**New Zealand migrants to Australia: Social construction of migrant identity.**

Green, Alison

*Award date:*  
2007

[Link to publication](#)

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

NEW ZEALAND MIGRANTS TO AUSTRALIA: SOCIAL  
CONSTRUCTION OF MIGRANT IDENTITY

ALISON E. GREEN

Ph.D. THESIS

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
BOND UNIVERSITY

SUBMITTED OCTOBER 2006

### **Signed Certification of Sources**

This thesis is submitted to Bond University in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

This thesis represents my own work and contains no material which has been previously submitted for a degree or diploma at this University or any other institution, except where due acknowledgement is made.

Signature: ..... Date: .....

## Acknowledgements

First, a big thank you to my supervisor Dr Mary Power for encouraging me to embark on the PhD journey, for generously sharing your knowledge, expertise and making yourself freely available for consultation.

Thanks also to Professor Raoul Mortley, for providing research semesters to work on the thesis, and financial assistance for conference travel to allow me to present conference papers from work on this thesis, giving me the opportunity to incorporate valuable feedback from academic colleagues on both sides of the Tasman. To Jeff Brand thank you for your assistance with methodology and encouragement to “get it done”. A big thank you also to Psychology Department colleagues Dick Hicks and Gary Kidd for valuable feedback on my overall approach, and Mark Bahr for generously sharing your statistical expertise. Thank you also to Deannah Jang for your generous assistance with SPSS statistical tests. To my colleagues and fellow PhD students at Bond University thank you for encouragement and support.

To my husband, Errol McLeary, thank you for your encouragement to move “across the ditch” in 2002, your love and support throughout this project, and for “keeping the home fires burning” while I have been concentrating on research. Thank you also for our many discussions about New Zealand culture and current events. To my daughters, Melissa and Fleur McLeary, aged 14 and 11 when I started the PhD journey, thank you for your interest and support, for stepping up and taking over household chores, and your belief in me as a “great role model”.

Thanks also to those who provided assistance and support from the New Zealand side of the Tasman. To my brother, David Green, thank you for your support and encouragement, for your input on New Zealand history and current events, and editorial and proof-reading assistance with chapter 4. Thanks also to Lydia Smith, Cathy Timperley, and Josephine Ellis who provided assistance with practical aspects of the stayer interviews.

I would also like to thank the interview participants who gave generously of their time, spoke frankly about their experiences, and were enthusiastic about the project. Thanks

must also go to those who completed the questionnaires, especially respondents who took it upon themselves to disseminate the survey widely to friends and associates.

Finally, a big thank you to my parents Ruth and Warren Green for their belief in the value of higher education and their desire that I attend university, something they had been unable to do. My years at the University of Otago awakened a thirst for learning that has continued throughout my adult life.

## Summary

New Zealanders' motivations for migrating to Australia and the effect of migration on their cultural and national identity were examined through analysis of interviews and surveys with New Zealand migrants and stayers. Factors influencing the move included economic pull factors, lifestyle factors, family reunification, some dissatisfaction with New Zealand society, the desire for a change, and a sense of adventure. Participants reported a high level of satisfaction with their new lives in Australia, and once resident there, initial motivating reasons merged with factors which reinforced and justified the decision to move. These included the benefits of a warmer climate, the perception that Australia was a more relaxed and tolerant society, and the belief by Maori that living in Australia freed them from negative stereotypes.

New Zealand migrants to Australia revised their identity in light of their new experiences, and yet continued to view New Zealand positively, retaining aspects of their New Zealand identity as part of their ongoing evolving identity. However, while feeling at home in both countries, as time went on many migrants adopted a more Australian identity. Over time, they considered Australia was superior in a number of respects, and adapted and changed in response to Australian influences. Despite this, migrants maintained the boundary between New Zealand and Australian characteristics through a process of constant comparisons and, somewhat ambivalently, retained their strong positive regard for New Zealand. In the main, participants considered they could be happy in either country, but were happier in Australia. Migrants constructed positive reasons to justify their move and viewed themselves as adventurous and determined, while stayers constructed equally positive reasons for staying in New Zealand, seeing themselves as settled and stable.

## Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Summary	iv
List of Tables	ix
 Chapter 1:	
Introduction	1
- Project one design: Interviews with New Zealanders living in Australia	3
o Ethical considerations	6
o Methodological framework	10
- Overview of chapters 2 to 10	18
Chapter 2:	
Results Project One: Migrant Interview Themes	19
- New Zealanders' cultural and national identity	20
- New Zealanders' migration experience	26
- Identity of New Zealanders in Australia	35
- Boundary maintenance between New Zealand and Australian identity	43
- Transnationalism	46
- Further research projects and literature review	51
Chapter 3:	
Literature Review One: The Social Construction of Identity	52
- Social and symbolic constructionism	53
- Concepts of social identity	55
- Concepts of cultural and national identity	57
- Boundary maintenance	67
- Explanations for positive views of national and cultural identity	69
- Conclusion and research questions arising from social construction of identity literature	73

Chapter 4:	Literature Review Two: New Zealand's Cultural and National Identity	76
	- New Zealand cultural and national identity	77
	o Influence of Maori culture	84
	- Australian cultural and national identity	90
	- Similarities and differences between Australian and New Zealand identities	93
	- Australia – New Zealand relations	98
	- Conclusion and research questions arising from New Zealand's cultural and national identity literature	100
Chapter 5:	Literature Review Three: Migration and Transnationalism	102
	- Factors motivating people to migrate	103
	- Studies of migration from one first world country to another	108
	- Cultural adaptation	110
	- Cost benefit analysis	113
	- Interpersonal dialectics	113
	- Transnational connections	114
	- Effect of migration and transnationalism on identity	119
	- Migration by New Zealanders: Historical perspective	121
	- Trans-Tasman migration	123
	- Conclusion and research questions arising from migration and transnationalism literature	130
Chapter 6:	Methodology: Projects Two & Three	133
	- Methodological framework	138
	o Project two: Survey of New Zealanders in Australia	139
	o Project three: Stayer interviews and survey	143
	- Methodological limitations	147



Chapter 7:	Results Project Two: Migrant Survey	151
	- Relative importance of pull, push, and personal satisfaction factors	151
	- Relative importance of economic and lifestyle factors	152
	- Dissatisfied migrants level of satisfaction with Australia	153
	- Effect of age and life stage	154
	- Proportion of Maori and <i>Pakeha</i> who were secondary migrants	155
	- Maintenance of social and emotional ties with New Zealand	157
	- Expanded perception of “home”	162
	- Other details of connections with New Zealand	164
Chapter 8:	Results Project Three: Stayer Interviews and Survey	167
	- Stayers perception of why their family member(s) moved to Australia	169
	- Stayers reasons for remaining in New Zealand	173
	- New Zealanders’ cultural and national identity	177
	- Boundary maintenance between New Zealand and Australian identity	184
	- Other details of survey results	188
Chapter 9:	Discussion and Analysis of Results	192
	- New Zealand’s cultural and national identity	192
	- Reasons for migration and migration experience	198
	- Identity of New Zealanders in Australia	214
	- Boundary maintenance	221
	- Transnationalism	230
	- Migrants and stayers constructing identities and justifying decisions	240
Chapter 10:	Implications and Conclusions	247
References		258
Publications	by the candidate	284

Appendices	- Appendix 1: Migrant Interview Questions	285
	- Appendix 2: Migrant Interview Explanatory Statement	286
	- Appendix 3: Migrant and Stayer Interview Consent Form	287
	- Appendix 4: Migrant Survey	288
	- Appendix 5: Migrant Survey Explanatory Statement	293
	- Appendix 6: Stayer Interview Questions	294
	- Appendix 7: Stayer Interview Explanatory Statement	295
	- Appendix 8: Stayer Survey	296
	- Appendix 9: Stayer Survey Explanatory Statement	301

## List of Tables

Table 2.1	Overview of Interview Themes: New Zealanders Living in Australia	21
Table 3.1	Hofstede's Cultural Values Scores for Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and Great Britain	61
Table 6.1	Research Questions and Hypotheses Listed According to Themes	133
Table 6.2	Migrant Survey Respondent Characteristics	142
Table 6.3	Stayer Survey Respondent Characteristics	146
Table 7.1	Reasons for Moving to Australia Classified into Pull, Personal Satisfaction, and Push Factors	152
Table 7.2	Economic and Lifestyle Factors	153
Table 7.3	Effect of Age and Life-Stage on Reasons for Moving to Australia	156
Table 7.4	Comparison of Time in Australia with Where Closest Friends Were From	158
Table 7.5	Comparison of Time in Australia with Sports Team Supported	158
Table 7.6	Comparison of Time in Australia with Country Emotionally Attached to	159
Table 7.7	Comparison of Time in Australia with National Identification	159
Table 7.8	Comparison of Time in Australia and Number of Visitors from New Zealand	161
Table 7.9	Comparison of Time in Australia and Phone and Email Contact with New Zealand	162
Table 7.10	Comparison of Time in Australia and Sense of Belonging	163
Table 7.11	Comparison of Time in Australia with Number of Visits to New Zealand	164
Table 7.12	Migrants Changes Since Moving to Australia	165
Table 7.13	Reasons for Becoming or not Becoming an Australian Citizen	166
Table 8.1	Overview of Stayer Interview and Survey Themes	168

Table 8.2	Migrants' Reasons for Moving to Australia, Stayers' Perceptions of Reasons Friend or Family Member Moved to Australia, and Factors Stayers Found Attractive About Australia	172
Table 8.3	Factors Which Made Stayers Remain in New Zealand	176
Table 8.4	Frequency of Stayers Phone, Email, SMS, and Live Internet Chat Contact with Australia	189
Table 8.5	Stayers Views of New Zealanders' Characteristics	190

## Chapter 1: Introduction

New Zealanders are moving to Australia in increasing numbers. In the five years to June 2000 New Zealand contributed the largest number of settlers, 18% of the total (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2003b). New Zealand born migrants are the second-largest overseas-born group in Australia, after British (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2004). In June 2005 an estimated 449,000 New Zealanders were living in Australia (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006a).

New Zealanders have a continuous history of migration; they come from somewhere else, move frequently within New Zealand, and many of them live overseas (Bedford, 2001, 2003; King, 1991). The equivalent of 17% of New Zealand's four million residents was estimated to be living overseas in 2003 (Bedford, Ho, & Hugo, 2003), with Australia being the most popular destination, accounting for about two-thirds of all New Zealand migrants (Bushnell & Choy, 2001), followed by the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, and Ireland (Catley, 2001a).

The migration of large numbers of New Zealanders to Australia has implications for both the Australian and New Zealand economies, and both societies, as well as for families with members in both countries. Concerns that New Zealand loses its best and brightest citizens, the so called "brain drain", is frequently discussed in New Zealand (Bedford, 2001; Harvey, 2004, March 16; Kerr, 2001; Lidgard & Gilson, 2002). During 2005 and 2006 skilled New Zealand workers living overseas were urged by the New Zealand government to return to New Zealand in order to redress this perceived brain drain (Altman, 2006; Collins, 2005, March 12; Cunliffe, 2006; Stevenson, 2005, March 10; K. Taylor, 2005, November 2).

Studies have been conducted on the motivations for migrating and integration into Australian society of migrant groups from many countries including Vietnam (Madden & Young, 1993; Nesdale & Mak, 2003), Lebanon (Madden & Young, 1993), Malaysia (Madden & Young, 1993), Sri Lanka (Nesdale & Mak, 2003), Hong Kong (Nesdale & Mak, 2003), the Philippines (Alati, Najman, & Williams, 2004), former Yugoslavia (Colic-Peisker & Walker, 2003; Markovic & Manderson, 2000; Nesdale & Mak, 2003), and Britain (Madden & Young, 1993). However, no reported studies

have interviewed New Zealanders living in Australia regarding their migration experience. Academic research on trans-Tasman migration has been sparse and primarily focused on tracking migration patterns and mapping demographic trends with little emphasis on either the interplay of factors motivating New Zealanders to move across the Tasman or the impact migration has on their lives (Carmichael, 1993). In addition, few, if any, studies have compared the views of migrants with those of family members who have remained in New Zealand. It was therefore timely to conduct a study which examined the experiences of New Zealanders who had moved to Australia from their own perspectives in order to provide data on their reasons for migrating, their subsequent experiences, and the effect of migration on their sense of identity.

In the specific context of migration between similar and closely connected nations, New Zealand and Australia, this thesis aimed to examine both individual motivations to migrate and the effect of migration on migrant's subsequent cultural, personal, and national identity. Accordingly, the overall research question for this study was: "What do New Zealanders communicate about their motivations to migrate to Australia and what effect does their migration have on their national and cultural identity?"

The research plan for this study was to move from the particular experience of migrants to a broader understanding of cultural and social factors influencing those experiences. Accordingly, the research was designed in three phases represented by three projects, with the latter two projects designed to triangulate results and establish if there were convergent themes from different stakeholders' perspectives, using differing methodologies.

1. A qualitative interview study of 31 New Zealand migrants to Australia, following a phenomenological, grounded theory approach.
2. A survey of a wider sample of 309 New Zealand migrants to Australia based on
  - a. interview themes established in project one,
  - b. an analysis of theories of identity construction, literature on New Zealand and Australia's cultural and national identity, and migration.
3. Interviews with 16 New Zealand "stayers" and surveys of 103 stayers with family or friends living in Australia to examine their views of the motivations

of those who left, and gather their perceptions of New Zealand and Australian society. The term “stayer” is used throughout this thesis as a shorthand way of referring to participants who lived in New Zealand because the term non-migrant places an unintended value on migration.

This study employed an emergent research process. In the first instance research activities were grounded in what the participants themselves saw as the issues. Rather than examining the extent to which New Zealand migrants to Australia fitted pre-existing theories, the study aimed to generate data from the interviewees’ own experience to find out how New Zealanders perceived they came to live in Australia and how they explained their subsequent experiences. Accordingly, project one consisted of in-depth semi-structured interviews with New Zealand migrants to Australia, based on the overall research question: “what do New Zealanders communicate about their motivations to migrate to Australia and what effect does their migration have on their national and cultural identity?”

This phenomenological approach was followed by a search of the literature on identity construction, cultural and national identity, and migration. Specific research questions and hypotheses were generated from themes identified by project one interviewees, developed through a review of relevant literature, and tested in projects two and three.

Chapter 1 outlines the rationale and design of project one. A phenomenological participant-led approach was used to identify themes relating to the migration experience and the effect of migration on cultural and national identity which, together with concepts derived from literature surveys, were explored further in projects two and three. An overview of the literature review chapters and of projects two and three is also provided.

#### Project One: Interviews with New Zealand Migrants to Australia

This section explains why qualitative phenomenological and grounded research approaches were used for project one. It also explores ethical considerations, notably avoiding researcher bias, and issues relating to research into indigenous peoples by non-indigenous researchers. Last, the methodological framework of project one, the

research design procedures, and information about participants, data collection, and analysis are described.

Between February and August 2004 in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with 31 New Zealanders living in Australia using a phenomenological approach, that is, allowing the lived experience of the interviewees to provide the initial direction of the project. This approach accords with methods derived from grounded theory (Dick, 2002; Glaser, 1992, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) where theory and subsequent research is generated from the data, and where the researcher allows participants in the study to speak for themselves with minimal intrusion of the researcher's own frameworks.

However, unavoidably researchers' views and assumptions about the nature of knowledge underpin methodological decisions, and the selection of procedures to gather and analyse data (Creswell, 1988; Crotty, 1998). In this researcher's view, reality is socially constructed resulting from individual experiences based on interpersonal communication (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Thus individual perspectives vary according to people's different experiences. Therefore, the epistemological basis for the study was humanistic arising from the socio-cultural, social constructionist tradition (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005).

This view of the nature of knowledge suits qualitative research methods, based on the premise that people have varying perspectives and experiences. The qualitative approach seeks to "give voice" (Patton, 2002, p. 6) to these differing perspectives to provide a full understanding of the phenomena being studied. Qualitative research methods provide in-depth, detailed information gleaned from a small number of participants. Face validity and credibility are the key concerns of qualitative inquiry. "The researcher is the instrument" (Patton, 2002, p. 14) and the credibility of the research lies with the skill, competence, integrity, and rigour of the researcher to capture accurately the respondents own views of their lived experience (face validity).

Phenomenology, described more fully later in this chapter, based on the participants' own views of their lived experience, was chosen as a research approach over naturalistic observation (ethnography) or case studies (Creswell, 1988). The



ethnographic approach had been used by anthropologists studying rural/urban Maori migration and adaptation (Metge, 1964) and could have been used for this research. The case study approach, used to study transnational connections (Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995; Portes, 2003) was also a possibility.

The phenomenological approach was considered most appropriate as it allowed the researcher to identify consistent themes motivating a diverse range of New Zealanders to migrate to Australia. This follows Polyzoi (1985) who considered a phenomenological approach was useful in capturing the migrant experience because it provided an opportunity for migrants to explore, clarify, and elaborate their experiences, providing “rich description” (Polyzoi, 1985, p. 52) which captured the complexity of their decision making and behaviour. The phenomenological approach was also considered most appropriate for a study involving Maori participants. Maori (Maori = singular or plural) have an oral traditional (Belich, 1996; Patterson, 1992), and many Maori prefer talking to writing as a means of communication (Smith, 1999). Maori also prefer a collaborative approach to research as discussed below, which accords with a phenomenological approach (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Gibbs, 2001; Smith, 1999).

In-depth interviews were used to obtain an indication of the complex interplay of factors contributing to the decision to migrate (Gold, 1997; Kontuly, Smith, & Heaton, 1995; Rogler, 1994; Segal, Mayadas, & Elliot, 2006; Stimson & Minnery, 1998). Interviewee’s reasons for moving to Australia were revealed gradually as rapport increased between the interviewee and the interviewer and interviewees moved deeper into their own experience. The factors presented at the beginning of the interview were not necessarily the primary reasons for the move. For example, one interviewee initially stated she had moved to Australia because of the presence of family members and because the climate was preferable. However, she later revealed that the untimely death of a close friend which led her to re-evaluate her priorities and goals had been a more important catalyst for the move. The complexity of factors motivating this migrant’s decision would not have been captured in a written questionnaire.

Before describing the methodology in greater detail, ethical considerations are addressed.

### *Ethical Considerations*

Researchers need to ensure their research design, data collection methods, and analysis techniques are ethical. Ethics approval gained from the university ethics committee ensured participants gave their informed consent based on adequate information about the purpose and conduct of the research (see Appendix 2, Explanatory Statement and Appendix 3, Consent Form), and that participant confidentiality was maintained. Results also need to reflect accurately the views expressed. Additional ethical considerations in this study were avoiding researcher bias as my country of origin was New Zealand and establishing a research approach appropriate for research into an “indigenous” group.

### *Avoiding Researcher Bias*

In qualitative research a researcher’s interpretations affect the way the results are presented and the validity and credibility of research depends on the researcher’s relationship with the research topic and participants (Kvale, 1996; Patton, 2002; Polyzoi, 1985). However, while researcher bias has the potential to affect negatively a study’s quality, Polyzoi (1985) argued it was a necessary aspect of understanding the phenomena under study. By this she meant the researcher’s pre-existing knowledge of the phenomena was what made it possible to interpret and draw conclusions. The relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee affects the interviewee’s view of reality (Kvale, 1996) and results in a “circle of interpretation” (Taylor, in Polyzoi, 1985, p. 53). However, in this research I tried to reduce any know sources of bias by maintaining a neutral stance while avoiding aloof detachment. I did not talk unnecessarily about my own experience although I did answer interviewees’ questions as briefly as I could to show interviewees that the interview was to be focussed primarily on them and their experiences.

Being a *Pakeha*<sup>1</sup> New Zealander with Maori (*Ngai Tahu*) ancestry<sup>2</sup> who had recently moved to Australia I was a member of the group under investigation. This had both

---

<sup>1</sup> While it has become common for New Zealanders of non-Maori descent, particularly those of Anglo-Celtic background, to be referred to by the Maori word *Pakeha* or “stranger” (King, 1991) (the original meaning of Maori was “ordinary”), it is recognised that the label *Pakeha* has negative connotations for some New Zealanders (Tilbury, 1999, 2001). It is used in this study as a shorthand way of distinguishing New Zealanders of European extraction from those who identify as Maori.

<sup>2</sup> While I have *Ngai Tahu* (tribal affiliation) ancestry my dominant cultural identity is *Pakeha*.

advantages and disadvantages. It was advantageous as I understood references interviewees' made to attitudes, values, people, places and events in New Zealand. This was useful, for example, when interviewing some of the Maori participants<sup>3</sup> who explained certain concepts using Maori words which are in common parlance in New Zealand. The advantage of being a fellow New Zealander was that interviewees did not have to spend time explaining or translating what they meant. This allowed interviewees to go more deeply into their experiences. However, I was aware that there was potential for my own views to bias the results. It was important that my views of the two countries, their peoples, and my own reasons for moving to Australia did not affect the interview and interpretation process.

I compensated for this potential bias in several ways, all of which are aspects of effective interviewing practice (Kvale, 1996). First, I avoided taking an interviewee's comments at face value, as this could have led to placing my own (inaccurate) meaning on what a participant had said. Instead I asked probing questions so interviewees clarified what they meant in their own words, making their intended meaning clear. For example, several interviewees said they moved to Australia for "lifestyle" reasons. This was a factor in my own family's decision to migrate to Australia. We were finding it increasingly hard to meet our financial commitments in Auckland and moved, in part, because we believed the cost of living was lower in Australia. However when probed, interviewees revealed their own differing explanations of lifestyle reasons. Some participants were indeed referring to the lower cost of living in Australia which provided the opportunity for a better lifestyle. However, other participants were referring to the outdoor activities possible in a warmer climate. Second, I was careful to maintain a uniformly interested and enquiring demeanour regardless of whether I agreed or disagreed with the views the interviewee was expressing. Instead, I encouraged the interviewee to elaborate and ensured the views expressed were adequately represented in the data. Third, I discussed the interview transcripts with my Australian supervisor, a neutral third party, to ensure that ethnocentrism did not bias results. This led, at times, to lengthy discussions revealing differences of interpretation regarding the meaning and

---

<sup>3</sup> As many New Zealanders have Maori ancestry it is up to individuals whether or not they identify as Maori. Participants were not asked their ethnic identity. I considered them New Zealanders unless they self-identified as Maori. In this way I avoided personal judgments about participant's backgrounds.

significance of the interviewee's comments, resulting in an emphasis on objectivity, and on what the interviewee actually said, rather than impressions. Finally, I was mindful of grounded theory approaches which call for evidence of participants' views in the derivation of research concepts and themes. I used Nvivo computer software, as discussed below, to ensure the themes identified accurately represented participants' views.

In summary, as I was aware of the need to avoid potential bias generated by being a member of the group being studied, I took steps to avoid it, and as a result I consider the effect on the integrity of the study was no greater than if the research had been conducted by an outsider. In fact, there was a positive benefit in being an "insider", as the interview process led to in-depth revelations unlikely to have been obtained by an "outsider" who may have been unaware of the subtle but powerful effects of attitudes and expectations exhibited in New Zealand culture and society.

#### *Research into Indigenous Peoples by a Non-Indigenous Researcher*

As well as the potential for researcher bias, ethical issues relating to research into indigenous peoples by non-indigenous researchers needed to be addressed (National Health and Medical Research Council, 2003). Maori have values, attitudes, and behaviours that differ from those of *Pakeha* New Zealanders (Patterson, 1992; R. Walker, 1989; A. Webster & Perry, 2003; Willmott, 1989). In addition, Maori have expressed concerns about the unequal power relationship between the researcher and the researched leading to the exploitation of Maori participants, and the failure of Maori to benefit from research activities carried out by non-Maori researchers. Indeed, some Maori have argued that Maori researchers should be the only people to conduct research with Maori (Smith, 1999).

There has been considerable debate in New Zealand regarding the parameters within which it is acceptable for non-Maori to use Maori as research participants. In conducting research with indigenous people and Maori, in particular, Smith (1999) suggested that researchers are advised to develop their knowledge and understanding of Maori culture and values, and to conduct research in consultation with Maori so that research is collaborative in that Maori have input into its purpose and conduct. It

is also suggested that *Pakeha* researchers mentor Maori to develop research skills so they may conduct research with Maori in the future.

An important ethical consideration was therefore how to address issues relating to research into Maori by a non-Maori researcher. In New Zealand the preferred approach would be for the researcher to approach the *kaumatua* (elders) of the relevant *iwi* (tribe) to discuss the proposed research, to proceed only if their approval was obtained, and, in the spirit of reciprocity, to share knowledge and report back to the people being researched (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Gibbs, 2001; Smith, 1999). I had to decide how to address these issues outside New Zealand in the context of the current research which explored New Zealanders reasons for moving to Australia and the subsequent effect on their cultural and national identity.

At the outset of the study, I had to decide who to include in this study of New Zealanders in Australia. For project one I chose not to include New Zealanders with, for example, Pacific Island, Asian, or South African origins as these sub-groups may have dual national identities. That left me with the dilemma of whether or not to include Maori in the study. To focus exclusively on *Pakeha* New Zealanders would have ignored the “voices” of an important part of the New Zealand population and lay the study open to criticism. As Maori made up approximately 9% of the New Zealand-born population in Australia (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003), compared with 15% in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2006a), and potentially had differing reasons for leaving New Zealand and differing experiences in Australia, I chose to include them in the study, but was aware of the need for sensitivity with Maori participants.

I chose a phenomenological, story-telling approach, in part, because it was a collaborative approach which made it possible for Maori to present their attitudes, motives, and values in their own words. In addition, I sought out the Gold Coast branch of the Queensland Maori Society at the outset of the investigation, making initial inquiries of Maori cultural group leaders performing at the 2004 Gold Coast’s Waitangi Day (New Zealand’s national day) celebrations. However, as I was told that the group was in recess it took until August 2004 to locate and obtain permission from

the *kaumatua* (elder) of the group. In the meantime individual Maori had participated in the interviews.

My university's ethics committee was aware of the need to proceed with caution when researching among members of indigenous groups and sent my application for ethics approval to an Aboriginal human research ethics committee for consideration before giving final approval for the study. In summary, efforts were made to ensure Maori participation in the study complied with the spirit of ethical conduct with indigenous groups.

### *Methodological Framework*

As discussed, qualitative research methods with a phenomenological focus were used for project one interviews. In-depth interviews were conducted to distil the essence of the lived experience of migration by obtaining, in their own words, "how people experience some phenomenon – how they perceive it, describe it, feel about it, judge it, remember it, make sense of it, and talk about it with others" (Patton, 2002 p.104), by focusing on their recollections of their motivations to migrate. The study drew on aspects of narratology asking migrants to tell their stories of why they moved to Australia and a grounded theory approach was chosen to derive conceptual themes from data emerging from the interviews. The phenomenological approach, narratology and grounded theory are discussed below.

As little research had been conducted on their motivation, a phenomenological approach focusing on the "lived experience" (Patton, 2002, p. 104) of New Zealand migrants to Australia was used. Using this approach, participants explored how they made sense of the complex interplay of factors leading to the decision to migrate and the resulting effect of their migration on their identity. Implicit in this methodology is a realisation that memories are reconstructed in the light of present perceptions and that a memory of one's reasons for a decision to migrate ten or even five years ago will be coloured and influenced by ensuing experiences (Gardner, 1999 in Ryan, 2003). Some studies of migrant's motives have seen it as a drawback to interview or survey migrants after they have been living in their new country for some time (Gold, 1997; Zodgekar, 1990), arguing data are more accurate if collected prior to departure. However, this study was investigating not only what makes migrants leave their

homeland but what makes them stay in their new country, and accepts that memories are coloured and reconstructed by subsequent experiences.

The interviews also drew on aspects of narratology by asking migrants to tell their stories of why they moved to Australia. A narratological approach involves asking open-ended questions and intervening little during the telling of the story (Kvale, 1996). Story-telling was particularly appropriate as it had been identified as an appropriate research tool to use with Maori participants, as it was participant-led and fitted with the oral tradition of Maori (Bishop, 1996). Interview transcripts were then analysed (details of the analysis follow in later in the chapter) and interpreted to reveal “cultural and social patterns through the lens of individual experience” (Patton, 2002, p. 115).

### *Interview Design*

The purpose of the study was to discover what New Zealand migrants to Australia communicated about their reasons for the move, how they viewed their migration experience and the effect migration had on their individual, national, and cultural identity. Using a social constructionist theoretical framework the research was designed to fulfil these purposes. Semi-structured in-depth interviews were appropriate for this component of the research because they allowed the researcher to seek common themes from a diverse group of New Zealanders and to view decisions and experiences from the perspective of those involved. While the interviews had an overall framework, there was scope for development in response to issues raised by the interviewee, as discussed below.

### *Interview sampling methods.*

A purposive, emergent (Dick, 2002: Glaser & Strauss, 1967) sample of 31 information-rich (Patton, 2002) participants (cases from which a great deal can be learned about issues of central importance to the inquiry) was chosen for accessibility to the researcher. With a grounded theory approach the sample cannot be planned in advance. Once data emerge from initial interviews the researcher seeks multiple comparisons to test out the applicability of tentative themes (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This is similar to the chain referral refinement of snowball sampling where multiple networks are strategically accessed to expand the scope of the investigations (Kalton,

1993, in Penrod, Bray Preston, Cain, & Starks, 2003). The researcher continues to collect data until saturation occurs, when the information gained from interviews is no longer adding to the researcher's understanding of the phenomena (Dick, 2002; Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

*Interview participants' characteristics.*

The majority of the participants (71%) were living in Queensland's Gold Coast region with 19% residing in Brisbane and 10% in northern New South Wales (the 2001 Australian Census showed Queensland had the largest number of New Zealand migrants (127,340), followed by New South Wales (105,890), and Victoria (55,520) (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003). As discussed above, project one was confined to *Pakeha* and Maori New Zealanders as opposed to New Zealanders with, for example, Pacific Island, Asian or South African origins. As Maori and *Pakeha* New Zealanders have differing cultural values (Patterson, 1992; R. Walker, 1989; A. Webster & Perry, 2003; Willmott, 1989) a study which explored the effect of moving to Australia on New Zealanders' national and cultural identity needed to adequately represent the views of Maori. Although Maori only make up approximately 9% of New Zealanders migrating to Australia (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003) a larger number than 9% of interviewees needed to be Maori to generate enough data to draw conclusions, so the final sample included 48% (15/31) who identified as Maori. Participation was limited to New Zealanders who were adults when they moved to Australia to ensure all interviewees had been involved in the decision-making process. Dick (2002) suggested putting together as diverse a sample as possible to ensure emergent themes were representative of the situation being studied. Efforts were made to access a diverse range of New Zealanders who varied in the following ways

- length of time in Australia
- age
- part of New Zealand they migrated from
- occupation and socio-economic background
- experience of other countries.

Multiple networks of *Pakeha* New Zealanders were accessed quickly and easily. However, it was more difficult to access a diverse range of Maori. This was resolved



by making particular efforts to network with Maori living in Australia by talking to key members of the Maori community at the 2004 Waitangi Day celebration on the Gold Coast, by contacting the Gold Coast branch of the Queensland Maori Society, and by asking members of the Pacific Island and Aboriginal community known to the researcher to assist with potential contacts. In all cases individuals were asked to participate as New Zealanders, not as Maori, but had the opportunity to identify as Maori if they wanted to.

Of 31 interviewees 12 were male, 19 were female (including five couples), and 15 self-identified as Maori. Interviewees were aged between 20 and 76 years and had resided in Australia for periods ranging from 6 weeks to 28 years, with two-thirds having lived in Australia for between 2 and 10 years. The majority of participants were aged between 20 and 34 on arrival in Australia although the age range on arrival was between 18 and 58. They worked in professional, administrative, trade, and semi-skilled jobs. Full-time homemakers, retirees, students, and a recently arrived job seeker were also interviewed. Some participants had lived or travelled extensively in other countries, while for others moving to Australia was the first time they had been out of New Zealand.

Because the project one sample is not representative of migrants in all areas of Australia conclusions from these data are not generalisable to all New Zealand migrants. The major concentration of New Zealand migrants is in Queensland (36%), New South Wales (30%), and Victoria (16%) (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003). It is recognised that, for example, migrants might be attracted to Queensland for the climate and to Melbourne or Sydney for different reasons, such as career advancement. It is further recognised that this sample over-represents women (61% in this sample compared with 49% of migrants overall (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2002). However, project one was designed to be indicative of the views held by migrants and was not intended to be representative of the entire New Zealand population in Australia. Researchers with a larger budget could analyse the migrant experience more fully. However, this study provides a template for future, more expansive, studies.

*Data collection methods.*

During the in-depth, semi-structured interviews with New Zealand migrants in Australia participants were encouraged to tell their own stories, rather than the interviewer suggesting factors which may have contributed to their decision. This form of interview is sometimes called a life world interview, defined as “an interview whose purpose is to obtain descriptions of the life world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomena” (Kvale, 1996 pp. 5-6). This is in line with Dick’s (2002) eliciting of data from the informants’ experience by beginning in an open-ended way and keeping the person talking without asking specific questions. A grounded theory approach involves concurrent data collection and analysis. Theory is emergent; it is generated from the data.

In accordance with a grounded theory approach, the question schedule developed as tentative themes emerged during the interview process. Initially, interviewees were simply asked to tell their story and identify what prompted them to make the move across the Tasman. It became evident that interviewees were volunteering their perception of the similarities and differences between Australians and New Zealanders and discussing how they found living in Australia, so this information was explicitly sought in subsequent interviews from those who did not volunteer it. These general questions were followed up with paraphrasing, summarising, probing questions (for example; “you said the lifestyle is better here, what do you mean by that?”), and multiple prompts (for example; “anything else?”) (Green, 2003). In later interviews as themes emerged there were more probe questions to seek explanations for themes and to explore exceptions to themes that had already been established (Dick, 2002; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Later interviews also included questions about motivation to take out citizenship and perceived differences between themselves and family and friends who had remained in New Zealand. The interview questions are listed in Appendix 1.

One disadvantage of working in a grounded theory framework, where the researcher does not start the interview process with pre-conceived ideas, is that later interviews which build on and use themes expressed in earlier interviews provide richer data. Over the series of interviews changes to identity emerged as an important theme. However, an artefact of the grounded theory method of generating data meant earlier

interviewees were not encouraged to elaborate identity issues to the same extent as later interviewees.

Grounded theory exponents argue it is unnecessary to record interviews suggesting the time taken to listen to and transcribe interviews would be better spent in conducting extra interviews (Dick, 2002). Accordingly, for early interviews, notes were taken as the participant talked. This method made it more difficult to capture potentially useful verbatim quotes, so later interviews were tape recorded, with written permission (See Consent Form, Appendix 3), and transcribed by the interviewer. Partial transcripts were adequate for the chosen method of reporting results which presented written quotes in an easily comprehended written style (Kvale, 1996). The transcripts left out hesitations, pauses and fillers and paraphrased digressions.

*Analysis and verification of qualitative interview data.*

Kvale noted that, ideally, an interviewer analyses the interview as he/she proceeds so that the interviewer can clarify themes with the interviewee during the course of the interview (Kvale, 1996). Accordingly, the interviewer sought verification of key themes before the conclusion of the interview. In addition, key themes and impressions were noted immediately after each interview, and the tape-recorded interview was transcribed as soon as possible after each interview.

Each interview was analysed for themes in an approach which owes allegiance to grounded theory principles. While Glaser and Strauss, the originators of grounded theory, disagreed over grounded theory approaches in later years, the overall principle that research and theory should be “grounded” in the data remains unchanged (Creswell, 1988). Grounded theory involves conceptual classification of recurring themes present in interview data. Using this approach theory emerges from systematic comparative analysis. For the first interview the researcher looked for categories suggested by the interviewees’ description of their experience (Dick, 2002; Patton, 2002). Themes from second and subsequent interviews were compared with each other until core categories emerged. A core category (category which appears central to the study) is one that emerges with high frequency and is well connected to the other categories which are emerging. Categories and their properties (sub-categories)

are coded and the sample size increased to increase the diversity of participants. When the researcher is no longer adding to linked categories or their properties the coded data are sorted with the emerging themes providing a framework for the results (Dick, 2002; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Some grounded theorists divide the process of data analysis into open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Creswell, 1988; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). These three forms of coding refer to increasing refinement in the labelling and categorising of phenomena emerging from the data. The open coding stage involves working with the data to discover commonalities and interconnections. This might involve the use of mind maps or other visual representations. At the axial coding stage the researcher makes decisions to focus intensively on particular aspects of the emerging data to make connections between categories. At the selective coding stage the core category or categories have emerged and the researcher is systematically linking subcategories to the core categories (Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

In the initial stages of the research this approach was employed and three categories “opportunities”, “ambivalence”, and “constant comparisons” (boundary maintenance) were identified. However, these core categories proved to be impractical as they involved oversimplification of the rich body of data and failed to capture the complex dynamics of the migration experience. Participants described their initial views, reflected on these from their current perspective, and surmised about their futures. To add to this complexity, participants were at differing stages of adaptation to their new country. Accordingly, while the approach used owes allegiance to grounded theory, a less rigid and more inclusive qualitative data analysis approach was used. This involved a categorisation process of multiple themes derived from participants’ descriptions.

Nvivo computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software was used to manage and analyse the data from the interviews. Partial transcripts of the interviews were coded and recoded as data was collected and tentative themes emerged. The main benefit of the software was its ability to group respondents’ comments, isolate issues and themes, verify hunches regarding the connection between emerging categories, identify contradictions and disconfirming data, and explore the relationship between themes

and demographic data (Tappe, 2002). Thus a process of refining and iterating themes was used. The broad themes identified using Nvivo were illustrated by examples from interviewees' accounts in consultation with my supervisor. In addition, intracoder reliability (Wimmer & Dominick, 2006) was established by the researcher recoding three (10%) of the interviews after the initial coding process was completed and reaching 100% agreement with the original coding.

Grounded theorists' opinions differ in how much the researcher should read the data as a stranger to existing literature in the field (Dick, 2002). A literature review provides a framework of the field, yet raises the problem of researchers being over-influenced by the perceptions of previous researchers in the area. The concern is this might influence the current researchers' view of what they see and hear in the interview. However, other critics argue that scholars need to build on what came before, and that a doctoral thesis must be based on in-depth knowledge of relevant literature. A compromise position between these two schools of thought was reached in that the researcher immersed herself in the data, and after absorbing and delineating key themes in the data, returned to the known literature in the field to use themes, observed by previous scholars, in later analyses of the data.

The specific research questions used for the two surveys, the stayer interviews, and analysis of results were developed only after the migrant interviews had been conducted. In accordance with a grounded research approach, these questions related to the themes raised by the interviewees and were not imposed by the researcher. As questions relating to whether or not New Zealand should unite with Australia, and the so called brain drain were not mentioned by interviewees they were not included in the survey, even though they had been raised by commentators in New Zealand. However, the approach was not purely phenomenological but, rather, a mixed methods approach as prior to the project one interviews, the researcher in making initial investigations into the field examined literature relating to reasons for migrating, and New Zealand and Australian cultural and national identity to develop a theoretical understanding of those areas. However, most of the detailed research into literature relating to culture, identity theory, boundary maintenance, and transnationalism was carried out after the project one interviews had been conducted.

Having described the rationale for and methodology of project one, an overview of the structure of the remainder of this thesis is now provided.

### Overview of Chapters 2 to 10

Chapter 2 outlines the themes and sub-themes identified from project one, migrant interviews, and provides illustrative quotes. These themes are further explored in projects two, migrant survey, and three, stayer interviews and survey. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 review the literature relevant to the themes, issues, and concerns raised by project one interviewees that informed the development of the surveys and interviews used in projects two and three. Chapter 3 outlines theories relating to the social construction of identity involved in themes raised by interviewees. Chapter 4 explores writings on New Zealand's cultural and national identity, and makes comparisons with similar explorations of Australian identity. Chapter 5 reviews relevant migration and transnationalism literature. Specific research questions generated from migrant interviews and the literature are provided at the end of the literature review in chapters 3, 4, and 5. In chapter 6 the survey based on project one and the literature review is described and the methodology used for projects two and three outlined. Chapter 7 reports results from project two: migrant survey. Chapter 8 reports results from project three: interviews and surveys of stayers who had family and friends living in Australia. Chapter 9 discusses and analyses the results of the three projects in response to the specific research questions. Chapter 10 discusses the implications for policy and practice of the study's results and draws conclusions for the study. The appendices contain copies of the interview questions, both surveys, and protocols for ethical approval.

## Chapter 2: Results Project One: Migrant Interviews

This chapter presents qualitative data from interviews with 31 New Zealanders living in Australia. Survey results from 309 New Zealanders living in Australia are presented in chapter 7, and chapter 8 contains data from interviews with 16 stayers with family living in Australia, and 103 stayers with family or friends living in Australia. These results are discussed and analysed in chapter 9.

The overall research question was: “What do New Zealanders communicate about their motivations to migrate to Australia and what effect does their migration have on their national and cultural identity?” Interviews were conducted using a grounded theory approach (Dick, 2002; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) where theory and subsequent research are generated from the data. Accordingly, each interview began with the statement: “Tell me how you came to be in Australia” In subsequent interviews the researcher used open-ended questions to cover issues raised by interviewees in earlier interviews (see Appendix 1, Migrant Interview Questions). Thus the process evolved out of contact with interviewees. After over 30 interviews had been conducted and several new interviewees introduced no new topics it was decided to conclude this phase of the research and move towards analysis and ideas for the further two projects: project two the survey of New Zealand migrants to Australia, and project three interviews and surveys of New Zealanders who had chosen to stay in New Zealand. This latter group were asked about friends and relations who had migrated to Australia and their own perceptions of New Zealand and Australian society, in an effort to triangulate the migrants’ perceptions. At this stage further more specific research questions, listed at the end of the literature review chapters, were developed.

Emergent themes from interviewees’ narratives related to New Zealand’s cultural and national identity, interviewees’ migration experience, changes in identity since moving to Australia, boundary maintenance between New Zealand and Australian culture, and transnational ties<sup>4</sup>. Sub-themes are listed below and in Table 2.1. The rest of this chapter elaborates on those themes and sub-themes providing illustrative

---

<sup>4</sup> An analysis of themes one, three, four, and five was published in the refereed journal the Australian Journal of Communication Vol 33(1) 2006, 35-52.

quotations in order to remain close to the meaning interviewees attributed to their migration experience. Some comments relate to more than one theme; these are placed under the theme heading they are most closely related to.

### Theme One: New Zealanders' Cultural and National Identity

#### *Positive Views of New Zealand Identity*

Interviewees presented predominantly positive images of New Zealand identity, suggesting that New Zealanders were superior to Australians in many respects.

#### *Integration of Maori Culture into New Zealand Identity*

The most frequently mentioned aspect of New Zealand identity related to the influence of Maori on New Zealand identity as a whole (mentioned by 16 of the 31 interviewees). However, there was considerable ambivalence around this theme. Positive views are outlined below, while views regarding the negative effect of racial tension are presented later in this section.

Some interviewees perceived Maori culture as making New Zealand unique.

The Maori culture has been ... successfully interwoven into the New Zealand culture ... for instance ... Government departments answer the phone with *kia ora* [hello]... even though I'm not Maori that feels part of what it is to be a New Zealander. (20-year-old woman, resident in Australia for a year)



*Table 2.1*  
*Overview of Interview Themes: New Zealanders Living in Australia*

Theme 1	Theme 2	Theme 3	Theme 4	Theme 5
New Zealand's Cultural & National identity	Migration Experience	Identity of New Zealanders in Australia	Boundary Maintenance Between New Zealand & Australia	Transnationalism
<b>Positive views of NZ identity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integration of Maori culture</li> <li>Work ethic</li> <li>Good place to raise a family</li> <li>Old fashioned values</li> <li>Outdoor, rural lifestyle</li> <li>Informal lifestyle</li> <li>Sporting tradition</li> <li>ANZAC tradition</li> </ul>	<b>Pull factors</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Job/economic benefits</li> <li>Climate &amp; lifestyle</li> <li>Reunification with family living in Australia</li> <li>Partner wanted to move to Australia, partner in Australia</li> </ul> <b>Push factors</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Racial tension in New Zealand</li> <li>At crossroads in life</li> </ul> <b>Personal satisfaction factors</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sense of adventure</li> <li>Seeking personal development</li> </ul>	<b>New Zealand identity retained</b> <p><b>Enhanced loyalty towards New Zealand</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced appreciation of Maori culture</li> </ul> <p><b>Identity adaptation &amp; change</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Convergence with Australian identity</li> <li>Divergence from NZ identity</li> </ul> <p>Multiple identities</p> <p><b>Effect of migration on Maori identity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Divergence from reference group</li> <li>Divergence from racial stereotypes</li> <li>Convergence of Maori &amp; <i>Pakeha</i> identities</li> <li>Pan-tribal identity</li> <li>Expanded identity</li> <li>Situated identity of Maori</li> </ul>	<b>NZ is superior</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better attitudes towards indigenous peoples</li> <li>New Zealanders are better workers</li> <li>Better place to raise a family</li> <li>Less American influence</li> </ul> <p><b>Australia is superior</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Freedom from racial tension</li> <li>Australians communicate more effectively</li> <li>Greater opportunities for Maori</li> </ul> <p><b>Other aspects of boundary maintenance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Humour &amp; trans-Tasman rivalry</li> </ul> <p><b>Boundary spanning</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social &amp; emotional ties</li> <li>Economic &amp; political ties</li> <li>Migration of networks</li> <li>Constant contact</li> <li>Attachment to both countries</li> </ul>
<b>Negative views of NZ identity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Racial tension</li> <li>Criticism of other people</li> </ul>	<b>Effect of age &amp; life-stage</b> <p><b>Migrants' self image</b></p> <p><b>Ambivalent reflections</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constant comparisons</li> <li>Decision easily reversible</li> <li>Pull of family ties</li> <li>Australia is a safe risk</li> <li>Ambivalence about citizenship</li> </ul>			

Other interviewees spoke about Maori having a positive place in New Zealand society compared with Australia.

Australia could do a great deal more for their indigenous people ... New Zealand has bent over backwards to honour the rights of Maori people ... Australia is way ... behind in that area ... Australia won't say they are sorry ... can't accept Aborigine people were very badly wronged. (*Man aged 60, resident in Australia for five years*)

In our travels [around Australia] the ... people we met were in the Hanson camp<sup>5</sup> with regards to the treatment of Aborigines ... see them as second class citizens. In New Zealand Maori are likely to be the school teacher, the lawyer and your dentist ... As a New Zealander you look at Aborigines and feel very sorry for them. (*Man in early 60s, resident in Australia for seven years*)

Australians know very little about the Aboriginal culture. Whereas ... New Zealand ... even non-Maori people ... know a greeting of some sort or something to say in Maori ... [haven't] met any ... Australian ... that has a great deal of knowledge about the Aborigines. .... what you do hear is often not favourable. (*Maori<sup>6</sup> woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for nine years*)

### *Work Ethic*

Migrants saw New Zealanders as sought after members of the Australian workforce because they had a better work ethic than Australians.

New Zealanders are much harder workers, have a greater aptitude for their work, and greater loyalty towards their employer. (*Male employer aged 60, resident in Australia for five years*)

Kiwis here have a really good reputation in industry, they're readily accepted. (*Maori man aged 60, resident in Australia for 16 years*)

---

<sup>5</sup> Pauline Hanson founded the right wing One Nation political party which campaigned on a platform of national unity by opposing government policies which, she claimed, favoured migrants and indigenous Australians.

<sup>6</sup> Quotations from interviewees which have been labelled Maori were from those participants who self-identified as Maori.

Australia was seen as a place where New Zealanders could make career advances, and surpass Australians on the career ladder.

I think ... they think we're hard workers ... that ... if they don't step up we'll step up and over them. (*Maori woman in late 30s, resident in Australia for 15 years*)

#### *Good Place to Raise a Family*

Young female migrants considered New Zealand was a good place to bring up children, linking this to drug use in Australia.

I think it's better for children to grow up there. There are more drugs over here. (*Woman in mid-20s, resident in Australia for four years*)

#### *Old Fashioned Values*

Migrants thought New Zealanders have more old fashioned values, and that this was a positive attribute.

New Zealand ... bit more old-fashioned in the way people are towards each other ... people look out for each other more ... children ... more sheltered in New Zealand ... from the influences of money and fast living. (*20-year-old woman, resident in Australia for a year*)

#### *Outdoor, Rural Lifestyle*

Migrants made nostalgic references to aspects of New Zealand's geography, climate, and its outdoor life.

I miss the lifestyle on the farms, the lushness of New Zealand and being able to run around in bare feet. (*Man in mid-30s, resident in Australia for 15 years*)

I miss the New Zealand way of life. Auckland harbour has better opportunities for fishing and boating, and is more beautiful and challenging than Melbourne, Sydney or Brisbane waters. I feel a greater sense of being home there than I do here ... I miss the variation in the New Zealand countryside. (*Man aged 60, resident in Australia for five years*)

Also a part of New Zealand culture and shared with Australians were the informal lifestyle, the sporting tradition, and the ANZAC tradition.

### *Informal Lifestyle*

The lifestyle. Very open. Very relaxed ... friends call in and you make the meal spread. It happens in New Zealand. It happens here too and that to me is so good. Whereas in the UK you have to make an appointment. (*Man who moved to New Zealand from England at 19 and to Australia in his mid-40s*)

### *Sporting Tradition*

Several male interviewees spoke of New Zealand's sporting tradition, particularly the All Black tradition as an important part of New Zealand identity and a symbol of trans-Tasman rivalry.

### *ANZAC Tradition*

Older interviewees commented on the shared ANZAC tradition as a bonding factor between the two countries.

The similarities were demonstrated with the ANZACs. ... As neighbours ... we will always support each other. (*Man in early 60s, resident in Australia for seven years*)

## *Negative Views of New Zealand Identity*

### *Racial Tension*

In contrast to the positive views of cultural integration presented above, racial tension in New Zealand was also a theme.

The racial thing over there ... getting worse ... notice it when I go back ... can't get away from it, it's in your face ... got a real chip on their shoulder ... want to be compensated for what went wrong. They've already been compensated ... should forget about it. Our family farm [in the family for three generations] is on Maori leasehold land. It was leased in perpetuity with the rate set for 100 years but they changed it. (*Woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for four years*)

We were tired of the political correctness ... you can't get groups who have had an incredible pay out at the expense of the whole country ... saying we want more. ... We were sick of being made to feel guilty about something beyond our control. (*Mother of three in early 40s, resident in Australia for four years*)

In New Zealand they're so much into the indigenous thing ... wore me down after a while ... all you heard about all the time, what they're going to do for Maori ... You turn the news on and it's ... some Maori issue ... Here ... Australia encompasses ... dealing with more cultures. (*Woman in early 50s, resident in Australia for three years*)

Maori interviewees in Australia had a different but equally negative perspective on the racial tension in New Zealand.

It [living in Australia] puts us in an environment where there are much greater opportunities for Maoris ... It gets us away from all that Maori bashing ... The Maori community in which we were raised was involved in a lot of ... protest ... didn't want any more to do with that. (*Maori man aged 60, resident in Australia for 16 years*)

### *Criticism of Other People*

Some migrants considered that New Zealanders were judgmental and critical.

New Zealand's very conservative ... New Zealanders will ... belittle you ... make a spectacle of you ... They're not as tolerant ... not as accepting to people being different ... you can't be ... different enough that you'll stand out ... Back in New Zealand I was quite judgmental ... maybe that's where the racism problem comes in ... over here they're not judgmental ... racism ... exists here but ... in general society it's not as rife as ... in New Zealand. (*Maori woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for seven years*)

### *Summary of Theme One: New Zealanders' Cultural and National Identity*

Migrants held predominantly positive, almost idealised views of New Zealand identity and considered New Zealand was superior to Australia in many ways. However, at the same time, living in another country had made them more aware of

some negative aspects of New Zealand identity which may have been taken for granted prior to migration. The effect and implications of migration on interviewees' cultural and national identity is discussed in chapter 9.

## Theme Two: Migration Experience<sup>7</sup>

Migrants were strongly motivated by pull factors, notably the perception of more job opportunities and a better standard of living. However, personal factors such as a sense of adventure, and push factors such as dissatisfaction with aspects of New Zealand's social and political policies, and being at a cross-roads in life, also contributed to migration decisions.

### *Pull Factors*

#### *Job/Economic Benefits*

Eighteen of the 31 interviewees mentioned economic factors; better job opportunities, higher wages, and/or a better standard of living in Australia as factors which led to their decision to move to Australia or which they appreciated now they lived there. Participants considered they were better off financially in Australia and that there were more jobs in Australia. For some, particularly those who migrated to Australia with young families, financial struggles in New Zealand, and higher wages and lower cost of living were key factors in the decision to move to Australia, while for others these were contributing factors. Dissatisfaction with their financial situation in New Zealand, and low wages were mentioned alongside the perceived economic benefits of living in Australia.

We had always tried to plan, but we were just going backwards ... There was a ton of work over here and they paid you better. (*Mother of three school age children, referring to husband's wages as a psychiatric nurse*)

[Partner] wanted to go back to Uni and retrain. ... I found I would earn enough to support us in Brisbane, but not in New Zealand. (*Mother of two pre-schoolers referring to salary as a radiotherapist*)

---

<sup>7</sup> Implicit in this methodology is an understanding that reasons for the initial move will have merged with the migrant's subsequent experience of living in Australia.

Participants considered availability of jobs combined with New Zealanders' reputation as having a good work ethic made it easy to get employment. The potential for self-employment was also perceived to be greater. Half of the male interviewees were self-employed.

Jobs were so easy to get. (*Semi skilled male in mid-20s*)

I applied for four jobs and got offered three of them. (*Qualified printer arriving in Brisbane aged 20*)

You find a lot of Maori own their own businesses over here. ... Not just Maoris, Kiwis ... I've got a friend who runs a business ... a lot of fellas come over and they get a job straight away with him ... They can step off the plane, next day into a job. (*Maori man in late 30s*)

#### *Climate and Lifestyle Opportunities*

Better weather was also cited as a positive benefit of living in Australia. The weather provided opportunities for a more outdoor lifestyle, the facilities provided in parks and the presence of beaches combined to afford opportunities for recreation. In total 15 of the 31 interviewees mentioned better climate as either a factor in the decision to move or something they appreciated now they were living in Australia. The climate was both a push and a pull factor with several interviewees citing an unappealing climate in New Zealand as a factor contributing to the decision to move.

The sun, the change of weather definitely. We'd had some incredibly wet winters. (*Mother of three from Auckland*)

And the weather of course. I love the Queensland winters, with their nice sunny days. (*Man in mid-20s, from Wellington*)

In the weekends the parks are full of families .... In New Zealand you don't do that .... The weather plays a huge part because it gives you the energy to do a lot of activities. (*Father of three young children, from a central North Island town*)

### *Opportunity to be Reunited with Family Members*

Twenty one of the 31 interviewees mentioned the presence of family members in Australia. For some interviewees the presence of family members was the primary factor in the decision to move to Australia while for others it was secondary to perceived job or financial opportunities or the desire for a change.

Son-in-law came first. My brother moved .... We were the last of our family to come ... my daughter ... who was already here had breast cancer ... we came ... to be with her. ... all live close to one another, within 15 minutes of each other. (*Maori woman in late 50s whose eight children, their partners and children, had all moved to the Gold Coast*)

Six months after we came ... Mum and Dad came over ... then ... my sister and ... her ... seven kids. ... Had they not come I might have found it hard to stay. But ... 'cause they did come over it's ... been like living in New Zealand ... my immediate family are all here. (*Maori woman aged 18 on arrival in Australia*)

I wouldn't have survived without an element of family. (*Woman in mid-20s on arrival in Australia*)

### *Partner Wanted to Move to Australia/Had Partner in Australia*

Six of the 31 interviewees cited having a partner in Australia, or their partner moving to Australia as the reason they had made the move. Four female interviewees were reluctant migrants, having moved to Australia to accompany or be reunited with their partner. They expressed more regrets about family left behind in New Zealand than those who had been instrumental in the decision to move to Australia.

### *Push Factors*

#### *Racial Tension in New Zealand*

The most frequently cited dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand among the non-Maori participants related to racial tension. Some *Pakeha* interviewees claimed the New Zealand government's attempts to grapple with issues surrounding claims by New Zealand's Maori population put non-Maori New Zealanders at a disadvantage in their own land, whereas Maori spoke of being tired of "Maori bashing", and of



factionalism within and between *iwi* (tribes). Ten of the 31 interviewees cited racial tension as a factor that motivated their move to Australia, or something they were pleased in hindsight to have escaped, viewing Australia as a country where they were more able to be themselves. Participants from areas with large numbers of Maori spoke of experiencing physical intimidation in New Zealand while others were frustrated with the Government's policies surrounding Maori claims, the wearing effect of the seemingly irresolvable conflict being given constant media attention, and the detrimental effect this was having on the economic wellbeing of non-Maori New Zealanders.

The main reason we came was the racism in New Zealand. It was awful .... I was sick of going places and being intimidated .... [Here] I can go out at night with my family and feel safe .... In New Zealand ... I was intimidated ... every day. (35- year-old man talking about being a young male in a town where a third of the population was Maori)

Maori participants referred to the opportunity to be treated on their own merits free from stereotypes imposed on Maori in New Zealand.

In New Zealand ... expectations because you're Maori .... Whereas ... here, I'm just another person in society ... I find it very accepting here. (Maori woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for seven years)

### *Cross-Roads in Life*

Interviewees also mentioned the end of a relationship, job loss, the threat of redundancy, a re-evaluation of priorities following the death of a family member, and escaping pressure as catalysts for moving to Australia.

*End of a relationship.*

Once the marriage broke up I knew it was just a matter of time. (Woman who moved to Australia just before her 30<sup>th</sup> birthday)

I left a relationship back in New Zealand ... main reason why I left ... to escape. (Man, aged 19, when moved to Australia)

*Unemployment and threat of redundancy.*

I'd finished my apprenticeship ... boss said you've finished your apprenticeship and you're finished here. (*Man aged 35, resident in Australia for 15 years*)

[I] had been in the bank about seven years and about half the staff had gone, through attrition ... scared, if I lose my job I'll have nowhere to go. (*Man in mid-30s, resident in Australia for nine years*)

*Life changing event.*

A family member that was my age ... died very suddenly ... life's so short. Just get out there and do what you want to do ... started thinking about ... what I wanted out of the next stage of my life .... I was reassessing ... When this person died ... it was like, this woman's dead, what's she done with her life? She's lived in a little box, in a little street and done nothing. She'd ... raised a family and done it very well, but I wanted more. (*Woman in early 50s, resident in Australia for three years*)

*Escaping pressure.*

Having worked 24 years with the government, needed a change ... I was a Police Officer and had enough ... Came over here and started afresh ... offered a job selling household gas ... it's quite a good little business ... I'm happy. No stress, no pressure ... Totally different tangent, away from authority, away from control ... my business flourished because of my input .... You get to a certain age and you think do I really want this or do I want a challenge? (*Man in mid-50s, resident in Australia for eight years*)

*Personal Satisfaction Factors*

Some participants described personal motivations for migration, such as a sense of adventure, and a desire for personal development.

*Sense of Adventure*

I was 20 ... I went on an adventure around Australia, ending up in Brisbane. (*Man aged 35, resident in Australia for 15 years*)

### *Seeking Personal Development*

We were in a rut. We were going around in ever decreasing circles .... I thought ... why am I living in the same place I have been all my life? I want to have other experiences. (*Woman in early 50s, resident in Australia for three years*)

### *Effect of Age and Life-Stage on Motivations to Migrate*

Interviewees' motivations differed according to age and life stage. Of the 10 interviewees aged 18 to 24 on arrival in Australia six said they viewed moving to Australia as a stepping stone to further travel, although none had ventured further, while two cited study as the motivating factor. This group was most likely to see the move to Australia as an adventure with seven of the 10 undecided when they left New Zealand whether the move was short-term or permanent. In contrast, all of the nine interviewees who moved to Australia with their partner and dependent children cited economic benefits and opportunities, both for themselves and their children as motivating factors, while six of the eight interviewees who moved to Australia after their children had left home said the presence of children in Australia was a motivating factor.

### *Migrants' Self-Image*

Migrants saw themselves as goal oriented, risk takers, and viewed stayers as complacent, lacking in drive, and unwilling to take risks.

You have to be a really strong person with a lot of guts ... it's definitely leaving the comfort zone ... some people have ... got enough guts to do it and other ones don't, and they'll be doing what they do for ever and a day.

(*Woman in late 30s*)

We love a challenge ... But our friends ... are quite content to ... only look at today and not tomorrow ... Most of them don't own their own homes ... They're only interested in today. They're not interested in what is going to happen tomorrow or five years, 10 years down the track. (*Maori woman in mid-30s*)

Some interviewees talked about the move to Australia as if they were trail blazers and migration fraught with risk and uncertainty.

You get scared ...leaving your family and your country .... I ... was well ahead of my time ... I didn't know anybody who had come over to Australia ... so ... I had no tracks to follow .... It was a big step. (*Man who moved to Australia at the age of 19*)

### *Ambivalent Reflections*

#### *Constant Comparisons Between New Zealand and Australia*

Migrants engaged in constant comparisons between their country of origin and their new home weighing up the perceived gains and losses, and some interviewees were ambivalent about where they wanted to live.

Whenever I go back to New Zealand I think I want to come back here and yet when I go back to Australia I think it's good to be back in Australia. (*20-year-old woman, resident in Australia for a year*)

Don't know ... would ... be able to afford to ... buy another house in New Zealand ... but there's also the health of my husband's mother and the health of my father .... So you ... weigh ... them up .... Do I want Australia? Do I want New Zealand? At the moment Australia's outweighing New Zealand ... But ... the dynamics could change in New Zealand ... health of the parents ... one factor. (*Maori woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for six years*)

#### *Decision to Live in Australia Seen as Reversible*

Seven of the 31 interviewees had not planned to migrate to Australia at the time they left New Zealand. They relocated to Australia for a short-term job or extended holiday and stayed on, initially intended to use Australia as a stepping stone on their way to Europe, or kept property and money in New Zealand because of uncertainty about the move. In addition, the decision to live in Australia was not necessarily seen as permanent.

When we came over we were undecided as to whether we would stay or go home. I packed up my house and rented it out and left my things in storage ... It took us three months to get jobs ... If we hadn't got jobs we would have

gone home. (*Woman who came to Australia with her boyfriend when she was in her early 20s*)

We're thinking about going back in a few years ... 'cause New Zealand's our home. (*Woman in mid-20s, resident in Australia for six years*)

### *Pull of Family Ties*

The greatest doubt about living in Australia and the strongest pull back to New Zealand related to family ties. The presence of friends and family in both Australia and New Zealand meant participants were emotionally pulled in both directions, made multiple return visits and entertained the possibility of returning to live in New Zealand in the future. This was particularly true of women who wanted their children to have close contact with family members in New Zealand. (At least one interviewee moved back to New Zealand after being interviewed because she had married and wanted to start a family.) When family networks straddled the Tasman, interviewees expressed sadness for what has been lost by migrating to Australia and a sense of incompleteness, despite the benefits of Australian life. Those whose children had been born since migrating expressed regrets about aspects of New Zealand life their children would miss out on growing up as Australians.

My [teenage] daughter ... decided to go home ... her Dad is over there ... she ... felt the tie to go back. She's been back there ... three years ... It was hard ... I'd raised her since she was three ... a shock. But I guess she had to go back. (*Woman in late 30s resident in Australia for nine years*)

I want to ... move back to New Zealand. I ... enjoyed my childhood ... I have such a good family. I think it's better for children to grow up there. If I had children my Mum would look after them while I went back to work. (*Women in mid-20s, resident in Australia for four years*)

The kids are missing out on that close relationship with their grandparents. We send the oldest back twice a year ... at home I went to 30 funerals<sup>8</sup> a year with Dad ... wouldn't necessarily know the person. Dad would say we're going ...

---

<sup>8</sup> The *tangihanga* or burial ceremony lasting about three days is one of the most enduring Maori rituals (Dansey, 1975; Mead, 2003).

go to one funeral a year here. (*Maori woman in early 30s, resident in Australia for three years*)

### *Move to Australia Represented a Safe Risk*

The choice of Australia as the country to move to over other countries represented a safe risk as the lifestyle and culture was as similar as it could possibly be to the one left behind.

Originally my partner wanted to go to Canada but ... I'm, too stable for that. I wanted to know where we were going and what we were going to do. (*Young woman who reluctantly came to Australia with her partner after knowing him for three months*)

### *Ambivalence towards Australia Citizenship*

Interviewees also expressed ambivalence about taking out Australian citizenship (eight of the 31 interviewees had become Australian citizens), and Maori, in particular, saw Australian citizenship as an act of disloyalty towards their New Zealand roots.

Maori feel to stay loyal is very important ... to become an Australian citizen ... a betrayal ... There's a lot of ribbing amongst Maori about becoming an Australian citizen and a lot of whispered confessions in the kitchen. (*Maori woman who had lived in Australia for 28 years, reluctantly became an Australian citizen to qualify for a student loan*)

### *Summary of Theme Two: Migration Experience*

Interviewees' motivations for moving to Australia differed depending on their age and life-stage. Most migrants had made a decision to migrate prior to departure however, others had come for an extended holiday, or with the intention of further travel, and stayed on. While motivated by economic pull factors such as higher earning capacity, non-economic factors such as the benefits of a warmer climate, the presence of family in Australia, and personal fulfilment factors, such as being at a cross-road in life were also present. Factors which pulled migrants to Australia combined with those that pushed them from New Zealand. Additional benefits, such as the perception Australia was a more relaxed, positive, and accepting society - discussed more fully under theme three below, discovered subsequent to arrival in Australia combined with initial motivating factors to justify their decision to live in Australia. Despite expressing

high levels of satisfaction with Australia, migrants expressed regrets about what they had left behind. The implications of interviewees' attitudes, feelings, and motivations to move to Australia are discussed in chapter 9.

### Theme Three: Identity of New Zealanders in Australia

Migrants retained their New Zealand identity but also acknowledged they had changed as a result of migration, experiencing convergence with Australian identity and divergence from New Zealand identity.

#### *New Zealand Identity Retained*

Interviewees demonstrated enhanced loyalty towards New Zealand and greater appreciation and understanding of previously taken for granted aspects of New Zealand culture. Interviewees were strongly loyal to New Zealand whether they had lived in Australia for many years or were recent arrivals. Only one of the 31 people interviewed declared he had no emotional ties with New Zealand. A more typical response indicated continuing loyalty to New Zealand. One interviewee indicated that ties to New Zealand extended to a second generation.

We completely consider ourselves 100% Kiwis. *(35-year-old man, who had become an Australian citizen, resident in Australia for 15 years)*

New Zealand will always be home. *(Woman in mid-20s, resident in Australia for four years)*

The fact ... I was born, bred and am rooted in New Zealand remains .... If New Zealand is playing Australia and not just in sports we applaud and feel good that out of a small population we are doing well .... You can't stop us from being Kiwis. *(Woman in mid-60s, who had become an Australian citizen, resident in Australia for seven years)*

I like the lifestyle [in Australia] but I prefer being a Kiwi ... New Zealand is the place I regard as home. *(Man, aged 54, resident in Australia for eight years who migrated to New Zealand from the United Kingdom when aged 19)*

[I've] never become an Australian citizen. I'm still a Kiwi and so are my children ... We live in this country ... abide by their rules ... interact in society, but we are still Kiwis and very proud of it. (*Maori woman in late 40s, resident in Australia for 16 years*)

Our kids ... call New Zealand home even though they were... born here ... you hear your kids talking ... "at home they do it like this", and you go. ... you weren't even born there and they go ... but we're New Zealanders. (*Maori mother of teenagers, resident in Australia for 15 years*)

### *Enhanced Loyalty towards New Zealand and Greater Appreciation of New Zealand Culture*

Rather than simply retaining their New Zealand identity, participants expressed an enhanced loyalty towards New Zealand, often explained symbolically as support for the All Blacks.

I never used to like rugby ... but when the World Cup was on ... [I] got quite patriotic because I was away from ... home. (*20-year-old woman, resident in Australia for a year*)

I can get quite defensive ... ask some of my workmates ... they would say ... she's a Kiwi through and through. She's always flying the flag for New Zealand. (*Woman in late 30s, resident in Australia for nine years*)

### *Enhanced Appreciation of Importance of Maori Culture*

Maori culture had become more salient for Maori now they were living in Australia.

We ... have our heritage and ... background .... That's what makes us ... such a strong culture in Australia ... because we're outside ... our ... country ... it's magnified ... because otherwise we lose who we are .... A lot of New Zealanders ... been here for years ... still ... at heart know who they are, know their background. (*Maori man in late 20s, resident in Australia for 10 years*)

My Maori side wasn't strong when I ... came as a teenager but has become so through involvement with Maori here. I became fluent in the language in Australia. (*Maori woman in mid-40s, resident in Australia for 28 years*)



I wasn't so involved in Maori culture in New Zealand. It was all around ... didn't think much about it, just part of life ... now I'm much more into it. (*Maori woman in early 30s, resident in Australia for three years*)

In addition, some non-Maori interviewees considered Maori culture was a defining part of the identity of all New Zealanders which they missed now they were living in Australia.

Growing up in New Zealand there is a ... rich sense of diversity ... they all mesh together Maori, Pacific Islanders, whereas here ... there's a huge division .... The Aboriginal culture's very separate to the Australian culture. (*20-year-old woman, resident in Australia for a year*)

### *Identity Adaptation and Change*

#### *Convergence with Australian Identity*

Even though they showed a strong and often enhanced loyalty towards New Zealand, migrants acknowledged that the process of migration had changed them. They were simultaneously aware of a divergence from their old identity and convergence with what they perceived to be the Australian identity. Interviewees perceived Australia to be a more relaxed, positive, and accepting society, indicating that they in turn had become more relaxed and tolerant since moving there.

Australians are more laid back, not so conservative ... not so prim and proper ... they're more free spirits. They want to have fun ... want to enjoy the moment and that's what I want to do. New Zealanders ... take themselves too seriously ... can't get over themselves sometimes ... people in New Zealand who see me now say you're not the same ... I've become a free spirit. (*Woman in early 50s, resident in Australia for three years*)

Participants also commented Australians had a more positive approach to life than New Zealanders, which they found appealing. In addition, they commented on Australians' direct, honest communication style.

Australians are loud and boisterous ... happy and outgoing ... don't take much nonsense ... call a spade a spade. I quite like that. New Zealanders are ...

more English, more reserved. (*Woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for nine years*)

New Zealanders are prim and proper with a stiff upper lip. Here ... you shoot from the hip, say what you think ... but I would rather have it like that. You know what they think, and they don't bear any grudges. (*Man in early 60s, resident in Australia for seven years*)

While the direct, honest communication style of Australians was regarded favourably by several respondents, it was a negative factor for one.

We think they are crass, that what they say is a little bit border-line. The larrikinism that is so important to them, we think is childish. (*Woman in early 60s, resident in Australia for seven years*)

### *Divergence from New Zealand Identity*

Interviewees had diverged from their previous New Zealand identities. The move to Australia provided participants with a sense of freedom from the ties and obligations of relationships, a culture perceived to be critical and conservative, and from racial stereotypes. Some interviewees considered they were now able to develop as individuals in ways that hadn't been possible for them when they lived in New Zealand.

Being from a large family [10 children] it's nice to have my own individuality. Once I get back into the family circle I'm just part of the mould. It's a positive thing to be here on my own. (*Woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for four years*)

My life's changed ... out of the rut ... I've become like a free spirit ... I'm not here to be a daughter, or be a mother I'm now just me. (*Woman in early 50s, resident in Australia for three years*)

### *Multiple Identities*

Interviewees indicated they had a multi-faceted identity depending on the context of the interaction. As indicated in the following example, they might identify as New

Zealanders during trans-Tasman sporting clashes but as Australian, taking pride in the success of Australian sportsmen and women, in other international matches.

Interviewer: What do you see as your identity now?

Male: Definitely a Kiwi, *but*, if the Aussies are playing England, I'm an Aussie.

Female: But if the Aussies are playing New Zealand, definitely a Kiwi. (*Maori couple resident in Australia for nine and 10 years*)

Other interviewees recognized their identities were localised, that they spoke not of Australia or New Zealand but of particular parts of each country, while others talked of their lives being compartmentalised.

I only know Gold Coasters, it might be different in the rest of Australia ... I don't like the way Australians are trying to be like Americans. New Zealanders are individuals, at least the people in Dunedin are ... In Dunedin everyone's an individual. (*Woman in mid-20s, resident in Australia for four years*)

I have three separate lives ... my life in New Zealand, my life in Byron [Bay] and my life at [university] ... I've ... grown to ... like my three different lives. (*Woman aged 20, resident in Australia for a year*)

### *Effect of Migration on Maori Identity*

Maori interviewees were especially conscious of a changed identity since living in Australia. This related to a divergence from the attitudes and behaviours of their Maori reference group, divergence from what they perceived as racial stereotypes in New Zealand, a closer connection with *Pakeha*, and the need to adapt to pan-tribal expressions of Maori culture.

#### *Divergence from attitudes and behaviours of Maori reference group.*

I notice ... when I go back to New Zealand, *nothing's* changed. They're [siblings] still in the same life ... still do the same things ... still complaining about the same things ... It's like ... stepping back in time ... It's me that's changing ... to suit the lifestyle .... New Zealand's very conservative ... Australians are not afraid to ... get out there. .... Australians are very tolerant and accepting .... New

Zealand will ... belittle you ... make a spectacle of you .... They're not as tolerant ... not as accepting to people being different .... Back in New Zealand I was quite judgmental ... over here they're not judgmental. (*Maori woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for seven years*)

Husband: The most important thing that I got from coming here is finding yourself.

Wife: I think that too ... who you really are ... brings out the *mana* [inner self] inside of you ... because you're away from the ones you love ... you've got to find your own way.... In New Zealand life is about conforming to a set of rules. (*Maori couple aged 60, resident in Australia for 16 years*)

Divergence from previous identities extended to how interviewees viewed their previous places of residence as well as the behaviour of New Zealanders.

When we did go back for visits ... what we thought was a reasonable place to live didn't look so good when we went back. It looked ... rough. There's a big difference between the Gold Coast and South Auckland. (*Maori woman in late 40s, resident in Australia for 16 years*)

#### *Divergence from racial stereotypes.*

Six of the 15 self-identified Maori interviewees spoke of the freedom from negative stereotypes afforded by living in Australia. They considered financial and career success was easier to achieve in Australia as they were free to be themselves, unhampered by negative expectations imposed in New Zealand.

We felt a little oppressed and in ... a rut in New Zealand ... because we're Maoris ... at home you think you can't do those things ... here ... we felt ... like everybody else ... like we could do anything we wanted to do. (*Maori woman in late 30s, resident in Australia for 15 years, referring to her career progression since moving to Australia*)

Other interviewees explained the divergence in terms of wanting to remove their children from negative influences or in a reassessment of previously taken for granted behaviour.

[I] don't ... want our kids growing up in the area ... we grew up ... small community ... pretty rough ... wanted to broaden our horizons ... provide better options for our kids ... Waiting outside the pubs for their Mums and Dads, that's where we were living ... I don't want that ... [husband] and I moved away from it ... now they're not exposed to anything along those lines. (*Maori woman in early 30s, resident in Australia for three years*)

[In Australia] you go for a walk in the street and people are like, "hello, good morning" You do that in Auckland and, it's like "what are you looking at?" Everyone's got a chip on their shoulder back there. That's what it looks like when I go to visit. (*Maori woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for six years*)

#### *Convergence of Maori and Pakeha identity in Australia.*

Some Maori interviewees indicated they found living in Australia had changed their attitude towards *Pakeha* New Zealanders, commenting they felt closer to *Pakeha* in Australia than when they lived in New Zealand.

You find a lot of the Maoris and Kiwis ... here ... stick together ... back home we weren't really active in the *Pakeha* world ... we found it hard to relate to the *Pakeha* ... back home Maori/*Pakeha* is a big division. (*Maori man in 30s, resident in Australia for three years*)

#### *Pan-tribal identity in Australia.*

Maori commented that, while in New Zealand they had identified themselves and engaged in community activities according to their tribal affiliation, residence in Australia had led to an adaptation of tribal structures and engagement in pan-tribal activities.

Living in a Maori community in Australia is very different .... In New Zealand community work and involvement ... centre on the tribe .... Over here you can't do that because you're not living in your own territory ... we build communities around geographic areas ... patch together a family, all from different tribes and enlist the support of ... elders ... recreate the social structure with a difference. The main one being, we are pan-tribal. (*Maori woman in mid-40s, resident in Australia for 28 years*)

Back home it's all tribal ... when they come here you're all as one ... forget about the tribal thing. We're all Maoris and that's really good ... can't get that back home ... got to be as one here to make anything happen ... breaks down that barrier to one another ... Start a new life here. Mix in and be what everyone else is. (*Maori woman aged 60, resident in Australia for 16 years*)

*Expanded identity.*

Some interviewees commented on expanded horizons as a result of living in Australia.

Where I come from there are no other cultures. There's only us and us. There's no Asian culture ... no Indian culture ... Melbourne ... was very eye opening. (*Maori man, moved to Australia at the age of 19 from small North Island town*)

*Situated identity of Maori.*

The situated identity of Maori is complex. Maori interviewees indicated they might identify themselves as New Zealanders when communicating with Australians, Maori when communicating with *Pakeha* New Zealanders living in Australia, and according to their tribal affiliation when communicating with fellow Maori.

[Australians] don't view Maoris, they just view New Zealanders.

Interviewer: So you think Australians see you as a New Zealander who happens to be Maori?

Interviewee: Yeah, definitely a New Zealander ...

Interviewer: How do you view yourself now?

Interviewee: *Pause* New Zealander, Maori who resides in Australia ... always New Zealander ... not Australian. (*Maori woman in late 30s, resident in Australia for 15 years*)

The tendency to identify as New Zealanders rather than Maori when interacting with Australians was due, in part, to the perception that Australians regarded Maori as violent, heavy drinkers as they were portrayed in the movie "*Once Were Warriors*".

Australians associate Maori with "*Once Were Warriors*". They think ... Maoris are like that. (*Maori woman in late 30s, resident in Australia for nine years*)

In Australia when people ask me “where are you from?” I always tell them I’m a Kiwi ... don’t use the word Maori because ... people don’t ... understand ... seem to associate me to that “*Once Were Warriors*” movie so I ... say ... I am a Kiwi. For myself, I still identify myself as Maori, New Zealand born. I’ll never lose that identity of being a Maori ... would never want to. (*Maori woman in early 30s, resident in Australia for six years*)

#### *Summary of Theme Three: Identity of New Zealanders in Australia*

New Zealand migrants to Australia exhibited an enduring allegiance to New Zealand, however, at the same time as they considered they had changed since moving to Australia, becoming more relaxed and tolerant. Interviewees reported a sense of freedom from ties and obligations in New Zealand. Maori interviewees were especially conscious of a changed identity since living in Australia, reporting freedom to pursue opportunities not open to them in New Zealand. The implications of changes in identity as a result of living in Australia are discussed in chapter 9.

#### Theme Four: Boundary Maintenance Between New Zealand and Australian Identity

Interviewees saw themselves as distinctively different from Australians. Migration to Australia had given interviewees the distance to reflect on what made up their own culture, and they engaged in constant comparisons between the two cultures. Twenty seven of the 31 interviewees cited differences which marked the boundary separating Australians from New Zealanders.

#### *New Zealand is Superior*

Contradictory themes emerged. The first was that New Zealand was a better place than Australia as outlined in theme one. Interviewees argued New Zealand had better race relations, New Zealanders were better workers, New Zealand was a better place to raise a family, and New Zealand was less influenced by the United States.

#### *New Zealand has Less American Influence*

New Zealand was viewed as more politically autonomous than Australia.

Respondents expressed pride over New Zealand’s principled stance against what they

regarded as the negative influence of the United States. They saw Australia's closer alliance with the United States as detrimental.

I don't like the way Australians are trying to be like Americans. New Zealanders are individuals .... You don't try to be somebody else. You are ... who you are. Being like Americans turns you into followers, not ... yourself.  
(*Woman in mid-20s, resident in Australia for four years*)

The Australians are very Americanised, the Kiwis are very Canadianised ... softer and more relaxed .... The Americans and the Australians are full on in your face. I ... like being a Kiwi .... A small country but a lot of principles ... Australians are so easily manipulated. ... we're just puppets here. Kiwis very individual. (*Man in early 50s, resident in Australia for eight years*)

#### *Australia is Better*

The second theme evident in migrants' narratives was that Australia was a better place. Paradoxically, the same interviewees who presented New Zealand as superior to Australia in some aspects also held the contrary view that Australia was better than New Zealand. Interviewees' judgments were detailed and fine grained allowing for credit to be given to both countries. Specifically interviewees considered that Australia had less racial tension, that Australians' communication style was preferable as Australians communicated more honestly and directly, were more positive, accepting, and less judgmental, and that Australia afforded Maori migrants more personal freedom, as documented by quotations provided in relation to theme one: cultural and national identity, and theme three: identity of New Zealanders in Australia.

#### *Humour and Trans-Tasman Rivalry as Boundary Maintenance*

Boundaries or separation of New Zealand and Australian identity were set up in a process of constant comparison of differences between the two countries. Boundaries were maintained through constant humorous comparisons between the two countries. Migrants saw this good natured banter, which often revolved around sporting successes or failures, as a defining part of the relationship between Australians and New Zealanders.



The Kiwi/Australian ... bantering ... neither could exist without it .... Never a day goes past where I don't get some comment .... It's ... a bond ... unwritten law that you've got to have each other on. (*Woman in early 50s, resident in Australia for three years*)

Underlying this banter were assertions that Australians and New Zealanders were very similar, had a shared past, and needed to stick together, particularly now Australia was populated by people from diverse backgrounds. The influx of immigrants from Asian and Islamic backgrounds and threat of terrorism was perceived by some to be a unifying factor, emphasising a boundary between Western and other identities.

Despite the banter there is ... an acceptance by Australians that we are comrades ... especially now terrorist issues are ... in the news ... many Australians are ... wary of the Arabic ...the Mediterranean ... and the Asian ... can trust Kiwis. ... because of world events ... change in attitude ... when I first got here. ... jest about ... dole bludging. Now it's ... "you're our best mates". .... Definitely, best mates. (*Maori woman in late 40s, resident in Australia for 16 years*)

### *Boundary Spanning*

Although boundaries were strongly maintained and differences asserted there was also evidence of boundary spanning, or emphasising similarities between these two populations so that a sense of connection dominated. Interviewees mentioned a passion for sport, common heritage, laid back attitudes, a similar sense of humour, and similar modes of socialising, as similarities between the two cultures, and said they did not see much difference between the two cultures. The boundary between Australian and New Zealand identity became blurred, with some aspects shared, and others kept distinct. One interviewee described a merging and morphing with Australian culture.

Some days I wake up ... and think "what country am I in?" I don't think there is a great amount of difference. (*Man in early 60s, resident in Australia for seven years*)

*Summary of Theme Four: Boundary Maintenance Between New Zealand and Australian Identity*

Despite recognising many similarities between the two cultures, interviewees actively maintained the boundaries between New Zealand and Australian culture by engaging in comparisons, in which New Zealand emerged as superior in most, but not all, respects. The implications of boundary maintenance and boundary spanning behaviour are discussed in chapter 9.

Theme Five: Transnationalism

New Zealanders living in Australia maintained social and emotional ties, reinforced by multiple and constant interconnections, with both New Zealand and Australia.

*Maintenance of Social and Emotional Ties with New Zealand*

Strong emotional ties with family in New Zealand were evident. Interviewees also spoke of attachment to physical aspects of New Zealand, as outlined in quotations in theme two.

Three of my children are there and I've got grandchildren over there. .... I really, really, really love New Zealand. I love going back ... want to see the grandchildren. .... I've spent most of my life in New Zealand. New Zealand is the place I regard as home. (*Man in 50s who emigrated from England to New Zealand at the age of 19 and to Australia at 46*)

I want to ... eventually move back to New Zealand ... home is where the heart is. (*Woman in mid-20s, resident in Australia for four years*)

Emotional ties were particularly strong for Maori participants. Older Maori interviewees had a sense of connection with their homeland and retained the imperative to return to their tribal land to be buried.

I was born there and that's where I want to go back and die ... when I die I'm going home ... haven't been back for a while ... grandchildren ... want to see more of them ... I had to give up a lot ... my children and my grandchildren

are the most important things in my life. (*Maori woman in late 50s, resident in Australia for 16 years*)

I've lost ... a brother and a sister since I've been here ... that was hard .... We want to be buried in New Zealand .... We feel ... sentimentality about the house in Hamilton ... brought ... all our eight children up there ... It would have been nice to have kept it. (*Maori man in early 60s, resident in Australia for three years*)

Some interviewees felt strong connections to tribal land and a pull to go back to sick and aging relatives.

If I haven't been home for some time I feel the need to go back to New Zealand, but it's not Auckland .... I want to be at [small rural community] .... It's like stomping on your old ground ... take a day trip down there ... just be there ... then I've had my dose of it and I come home and I settle .... The length of settlement is ... longer .... It used to be ... six months. Now I can get past a year, but my Dad's ... been sick recently, so that's ... getting shorter again ... once I've been there I can ... go back to Australia and carry on going .... It's ... a soother for me. I ... love it very much ... down there. (*Maori woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for six years*)

These connections were particularly strong when natural disasters occurred.

If something major happens over there like there's an earthquake ... because we still have family there of course we're going to be concerned and on the phone immediately. (*Woman in mid-30s resident in Australia for nine years*)

### *Maintenance of Economic and Political Ties*

One interviewee spoke of maintaining social, economic and emotional ties with New Zealand.

We ... started to invest back in New Zealand .... We thought, we can buy houses here or we can invest at home ... we decided to invest at home ... we're sending my daughter back to boarding school next year ... talk to ... girls [friends from school] once a month ... catch up ... who's doing what. (*Maori mother of teenagers who had lived in Australia for 15 years*)

Some Maori remained intensely involved in the ongoing political activities of their *iwi* (tribe) however there was ambivalence around this theme. Attempts to arrange an interview time with one willing, potential interviewee who had lived in Australia for 27 years were thwarted by his frequent trips back to Auckland to assist with the claims made by his *iwi* (tribe). During one telephone conversation he commented:

Young people move here because they have had enough of New Zealand. The political climate has caused havoc between Maori and Maori.

### *Migration of Networks*

Networks of closely connected family or friends provided support both initially in the decision to migrate and in the early period in Australia but also, for many, in their life as Australian residents in the longer term. Maintenance of networks extended not only to family members but to networks of friends. Some interviewees said most of their friends were New Zealanders and that they had very little social contact with Australians.

I soon found ... I was surrounded by Kiwis ... my Uncle who I was staying with ... had ... New Zealand friends ... I ... never really left because I was surrounded by it when I got there. And now I'm up here [Gold Coast] in the capital of New Zealand. I'm at home. Why go back. I've got Kiwis and good weather. (*Maori man in late 20s, resident in Australia for 10 years*)

We don't have close Australian friends. They have grown up with their mates and have their Mum and Dad here. We have some good New Zealand friends. They're in the same situation. (*Man aged 35, resident in Australia for 15 years*)

Most of our friends are New Zealanders, like a big family .... I have [only] one Australian friend that I see ... outside of work ... don't do it on purpose but because you're meeting people at sports things ... you just seem to meet New Zealanders and you all bond together and become each other's family .... It's ... like being at home ... like you're there anyway. You've got your New Zealand friends, you hear about New Zealand all the time and you go and watch the rugby together, still cheering for New Zealand but you're ... living

in a different country. (*Maori woman in mid-20s, resident in Australia for six years*)

We find that all our closest friends are all Kiwis. (*Woman in late 30s who met and married a New Zealander in Australia, resident in Australia for 15 years*)

[Socialise] mainly with New Zealanders. .... You come here to get away from them but you stay with them when you get to this side ... don't think there are any Australians ... in our close group of friends. .... The New Zealanders that we've met have been through work or through sports ... we've ... all had the same interests and stayed close ... over these ... 15 years ... we've all had kids and all our kids hang out together. .... It's kinda family like. A whole bunch of friends ... [Maori and *Pakeha*] any New Zealander that turned up and didn't have any family. (*Maori mother of teenagers resident in Australia for 15 years*)

Two of my flatmates are Kiwis. ... Our first connections were Kiwis we knew from home. We kept meeting Kiwis. (*Woman in mid-20s, resident in Australia for three years*)

#### *Constant Contact Between New Zealand and Australia*

Participants perceived the lack of visa requirements and ease of movement backwards and forwards across the Tasman as positive factors. Most migrants had previously visited Australia; some made multiple trips to New Zealand for short visits, and had frequent visitors from New Zealand. Thus, interviewees were in constant contact with New Zealand family, friends and events.

[I've] been back ... five, six times ... went back ... in April ... went back last August ... try to go back at least once a year. (*Woman in mid-20s, resident in Australia for six years*)

We get so many visitors ... you never have ... time to feel homesick ... always got people coming over ... also ... been back three times ... for a wedding ... for a funeral and ... for a holiday ... you're only ... three and a half hours away. (*Maori woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for six years*)

[I've maintained links with *iwi*] through ... my mother's family and ... through the links that you make at boarding school. I talk to those girls once a month ... catch up on what's going on. Who's doing what ... whole political thing ... the *iwi*, tribes, who's got money from the government and who hasn't, and what they do with it. And then you think ... do I want to be a part of that? (*Maori woman in mid-30s, resident in Australia for 15 years*)

#### *Attachment to Both Countries*

Participants communicated their attachment to both countries simultaneously, and for some, the ideal situation would be to live in both countries.

By next year I intend to spend three to four months of the year in New Zealand and the rest of my time over here ... spending time in both countries. (*Sixty-year-old man, resident in Australia for five years*)

In two to three years I will be able to go home [daughter will have left school] .... I'll go back to West Auckland where I grew up ... that's where my family is ... I'll work in the community there. My [Australian] husband likes it back there ... happy to move there ... in a fortunate position ... husband has a business ... doing well ... would probably end up travelling backwards and forwards between the two places. We'd leave the kids at our house [in Brisbane]. (*Maori community worker in her mid-40s, resident in Australia for 28 years*)

It's so easy to slot in ... we're ... quite close as two nations. That's a comfort ... you know you're safe here. You're not in a totally foreign land where you don't know ... what's going to happen. (*Woman in early 50s, resident in Australia for three years*)

#### *Summary of Theme Five: Transnationalism*

Interviewees reported a simultaneous sense of attachment to both Australia and New Zealand. Their social networks, emotional ties, and, in some cases economic and political activities straddled the Tasman. Close links were maintained with New Zealand through frequent visits, friendship networks, and keeping up-to-date with

events in New Zealand. Transnational features of the identity of New Zealanders in Australia and their implications are discussed in chapter 9.

### Further Research Projects and Literature Review

The next step after conducting the project one interviews was to explore the generalisability of the themes relating to migration and transnationalism with a wider group, and compare the views of migrants about their motives for migration and perceptions of New Zealand and Australian societies with the views of stayers about their perception of why their family members or friends had made the decision to migrate. At this point wider reading of the literature based on themes, issues, and concerns identified in interviewees' narratives was undertaken to ensure coverage of key concepts. This literature review is presented in three parts. Chapter 3 outlines literature on the social construction of both individual motivation and identity, and group (cultural and national) identity. Chapter 4 contains a discussion of New Zealand, Maori, and Australian identity and their similarities and differences, while chapter 5 examines literature relating to migration and transnationalism.

Project two, a survey of New Zealanders living in Australia asked questions which arose from project one interviews and from wider reading with a broader sample of migrants. Project three interviews and surveys with stayers, who were asked why they thought their friends and family members moved to Australia and their own perceptions of New Zealand and Australian society, was developed to provide another view of the migrant experience, and to develop an understanding of why people stayed behind.

### **Chapter 3: Literature Review One: The Social Construction Of Identity**

Following project one, interviews with New Zealand migrants to Australia, followed by subsequent distillation of themes from these interviews, projects two and three were designed, first, to follow up the themes suggested by the interviews with a larger group of migrants, and with those who did not migrate, and second, to ground this study not only in the ideas suggested by a small group of migrants but also to reflect these ideas against the backdrop of wider literature on the social construction of identity, New Zealand and Australian cultural identity, migration and transnationalism. Theories of individual and group (cultural and national), identity construction discussed in this chapter are applied in chapter 4, to an examination of how New Zealanders construct their cultural and national identity, and in chapter 5 to migrant and transnational identity. They are also applied in chapter 9 to analysis of how New Zealanders adapt and change their identity when they live in Australia, and to differences between the identities of New Zealanders who have migrated to Australia and those who have stayed in their homeland.

The main components of the social identity theoretical framework used in this study derive from Tajfel (1982a; 1982b), Tajfel and Turner (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), Mead (1934), Blumer (1969), Jenkins (1996), and Brewer (1991; 1999). This chapter examines: social and symbolic constructionism (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Jenkins, 1996; Pearce, 1994), and the cultural values theories of Hofstede (1980; 2001), Triandis (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995; Triandis, 1995, 2001; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asaia, & Lucca, 1988; Triandis & Suh, 2002), and Stuart Hall (2000a; 2000b). Boundary maintenance (Barth, 1969; Cohen, 1982), social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991, 1999), and cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) provide concepts which clarify and organise data about how New Zealanders in the current study changed their ideas about themselves when they migrated to Australia. First, social and symbolic constructionism are examined to explain this study's theoretical orientation.



### Social and Symbolic Constructionism

Social and symbolic constructionism provides a focus on communication issues in migrants' decisions and self-perceptions. Social constructionism, part of the sociocultural tradition, assumes social connections are at the forefront of our sense of individual identity. One's sense of self is viewed as a product of social interaction (Gergen, 1985; Krippendorff, 1993; Littlejohn & Foss, 2005) with individuals constructing and reconstructing their identity through communication (Abrams, O'Connor & Giles, 2003). Social constructionism developed from the seminal work of Berger and Luckmann (1966) and from symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969; G. H. Mead, 1934) which highlighted the role of communication in the development of shared values through the assignment of meaning to words and actions. The self-fulfilling prophecy is an example of the effect this labelling has on self-concept and behaviour as the expectations of others affect an individual's future actions and self-image. Symbolic interactionism assumes that people are influenced by cultural belief systems encapsulated by the "generalised other" which provide information about acceptable roles, rules and attitudes which strongly influences individual values and behaviour and against which an imagined "self" is compared (G. H. Mead, 1934).

According to social constructionist theories, such as Pearce and Cronen's coordinated management of meaning, perspectives of the same event vary as a result of the meanings people co-construct through communication with others (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Gergen, 1985; Pearce, 1994, 1995). Whenever someone moves to a new situation and interacts with new groups their established meanings are challenged. Thus New Zealand migrants to Australia would be expected to re-examine their actions and behaviour leading to perspectives which differed from those of New Zealanders who had stayed in their country of origin.

Social constructionist theorists argue that people categorise the world the way they do because they have participated in social practices, institutions, and other forms of symbolic action (such as language) that make these categories salient. The "way people divide the world into categories is, in some sense, tradition bound, and thus transmitted, communicated and 'passed on' through symbolic action" (Shweder, 1991, p. 156). People view the world differently, depending on their background. Individuals' views of the world are affected by the reality society imposes on them

through social interaction between people who share a common cultural background (Shweder, 1991). The symbolic construction of common identity involves the use of symbols such as sports teams (in New Zealand, the All Blacks), icons (the silver fern), and shared rituals (the *haka*; traditional Maori war dance known by members of other countries because it is performed by the All Blacks, New Zealand's national rugby union team at the start of international rugby fixtures), to generate a sense of shared belonging (Cohen, 1982). These symbols unite the community's members and come in time to symbolise the community both to its members and to outsiders (Jenkins, 1996). This study explores the symbols New Zealanders use to communicate a shared identity and the ways their views of the world change when they live in Australia.

Social constructionism has been criticised by scholars who view reality as objective and the human experience as largely universal (Littlejohn, 2002; Pearce, 1995). These scholars downplay cultural differences, and assume that meanings and experiences remain essentially the same, regardless of who is involved. In addition, many social researchers believe that individuals cannot communicate adequately unless they share common meanings (Ellis, 1995). Notwithstanding this critique, social constructionism has considerable appeal for scholars who consider human experiences differ depending on cultural backgrounds. Social constructionism provides an appropriate framework for this study which explores the effect of moving to a similar but different culture on the attitudes, behaviour, and sense of self of migrants. The interpretive approach of this study allows for fluid and dynamic individual perspectives of participants to contribute towards more general themes. In-depth interviews allowed individual interpretations to be gathered and compared, thus it became obvious that migration was motivated by a complex range of factors depending on, for example, age, family circumstances, life-stage, ethnic background, geographic region, attitudes towards change, socio-economic level, and professional status. Interviewees in the current study interpreted their reasons for moving to Australia and subsequent experiences in response to their interactions with others, re-examining previously taken for granted aspects of their lives in New Zealand as a result of close interaction with Australians. Broader and more objective interpretations of experiences were obtained in projects two and three through responses to surveys.

### Concepts of Social Identity

Because it is dynamic and constantly being reconstructed, identity is a somewhat elusive concept (Brewer, 1999; Jenkins, 1996; Martin, Nakayama, & Flores, 1998). An individual has multiple identities (Collier, 2000), socially constructed through a combination of self-attribution and the acceptance of external definitions (Abrams, O'Connor, & Giles, 2003; Jenkins, 1996). Cultural and national identities comprise an important part of individual identity (Jenkins, 1996).

Social identities are a product of experiences at an individual level as well as those gained through group membership. Identity is created in part by the self and in part by shared identities (Abrams et al., 2003; Jenkins, 1996). "Social identities are not simply individual cognitive constructions; they are based on collective beliefs about shared attributes, values, and experiences which constitute the content of specific social identities" (Brewer, 1999, p. 187). Communication is central to the process of identity construction and reconstruction, creating a symbiotic and transactional relationship between identity and communication (Abrams et al., 2003). An individual's identity is formed and reformed as a consequence of his/her interactions with others. The challenge of this study is to describe, unravel, and compare these social identities as they are revealed in interview and survey responses of New Zealand migrants and stayers.

This "processual" relationship between identity and communication (Abrams et al., 2003) is explored in relation to the views expressed by New Zealanders living in Australia in chapter 9, revealing the complex and often contradictory nature of identity formation (Martin et al., 1998). Group identity for New Zealanders is multidimensional as Maori and *Pakeha* New Zealanders have distinct histories and cultural identities (Patterson, 1992; R. Walker, 1989; A. Webster & Perry, 2003; Willmott, 1989) and yet they exist together as one national group. Both groups share a common identity as New Zealanders, to which both Maori and *Pakeha* culture contributes. It cannot be assumed, however, that both groups will adapt and change in the same way when they move to another country. Neither can it be assumed that there will be homogeneity within each group. The multivocality of within group voices (Collier, 2000) and differences in ethnic identity salience, the degree of

importance of ethnic identity (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000), is recognised and is discussed in chapters 4 and 9.

Jenkins argued that similarity and difference were at the heart of social identity and that “individual unique identity” and “collective shared identity” were similar and related to each other. He defined social identity as: “the ways in which individuals and collectivities are distinguished in their social relations with other individuals and collectivities. It is the systematic establishment and signification ... of relationships of similarity and difference” (Jenkins, 1996, p. 4).

Similarity and difference is evident when people from different cultures interact. When this occurs individuals adapt and change, experiencing convergence with the new culture and divergence from their previous communication behaviour and identity (Abrams et al., 2003). The changes involved in moving to another country lead individuals to re-assess their identity because the experience provides them with new points of comparison, new social mores, and new expectations. Transnational connections, the ties immigrants have with more than one country (Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995; Glick-Schiller, Basch, & Blanc-Szanton, 1992; Vertovec, 2001), have an impact on identity as migrants embark on a process of “making values from two worlds fit” (Levitt, in Vertovec, 2003, p. 11), which is discussed more fully in chapter 5. This study explores what the migration narratives of New Zealanders suggest about how New Zealanders adapt and change when they live in Australia, and this is analysed in chapter 9.

Identities are enacted through avowal and ascription processes (Barth, 1969; Collier, 2000; Jenkins, 1996). Avowal, the image an individual portrays to others, is similar to Ting-Toomey’s concept of face, or public self-image (Ting-Toomey, 2000), while ascription refers to identities others attribute to individuals or groups through stereotypes (Abrams et al., 2003). For example, one ascription Australians had of New Zealanders living in Australia, before eligibility criteria for social welfare payments were tightened in 2000 and 2001, was that they were “dole-bludgers”, or people who would rather take welfare payments than work (Bergin, 2002). The process of ascription (Collier, 2000) highlights aspects of culture which insiders take

for granted. The ascription and avowal of the communicated identities of New Zealanders interviewed for this research are examined in chapter 9.

### *Multi-faceted Social Identities*

Individuals belong to a range of groups and cultures. They have multiple identities, representing and categorising themselves in many ways. As discussed above, group identity as a member of a culture and citizen of a country is an important component of individual identity. Individual identity also encompasses ethnic identity, class identity, identity based on geographical area, gender identity, professional identity, and organisational identity (Collier, 2000; Day, 1998a). A Maori migrant to Australia, for example, might simultaneously identify with the nation of New Zealand, with Maori ethnicity, with their tribe, with their extended family, with the area of New Zealand they grew up in, with their gender, their profession, and their sports team. It was therefore important that the current study involved New Zealanders from a range of backgrounds so that variations on what it means to be a New Zealand migrant to Australia could be studied.

The self, or face, the individual portrays is a situated-identity, meaning the image an individual chooses to project on any given occasion depends on the situation and the other participants in the interaction (Clement, Noels, & Deneault, 2001; Collier, 1998, 2000; Ting-Toomey, 1988). Individuals usually present the image that will most enhance their self-image. This choice of positive self-image is discussed more fully in the discussion on social identity theory later in this chapter.

### Concepts of Cultural and National Identity

Definitions of culture vary from narrow interpretations; culture is opera, art and ballet, to very broad definitions; it is everything (Samovar & Porter, 2000). There is, however, general agreement that culture is a socially constructed and historically transmitted pattern of meanings, behaviours and rules that have a profound effect on an individual's way of interacting (Shweder, 1991). From the moment of birth a child is taught how to behave. Culture is thus learned rather than innate and is transmitted via symbols including verbal and nonverbal language, images and icons (Samovar & Porter, 2000).

Samovar and Porter (2000, p. 7) described culture as:

The deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, social hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relationships, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions acquired by a group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving.

This definition of culture highlights the all encompassing nature of cultural identity, the way it includes unconscious aspects of an individual's orientation to life, and the importance of group identity in individual identity.

Other commentators have expanded the definition of culture to include the views of members of other cultures who interact with members of a particular culture, as expressed by Bakhtin (in Min, 2001, p. 17):

One cannot even really see one's own exterior and comprehend it as a whole. Our real exterior can be seen and understood only by other people, because they are located outside us in space and because they are others. Thus any phenomena or events of any culture require the perspective of other cultures to develop their potential.

In the current study New Zealand migrants to Australia refined their concept of New Zealand identity through their interactions with Australians resulting in a new understanding of previously taken for granted aspects of their national identity. Similarly, those resident in New Zealand use other cultures, often Australian, sometimes American, in refining their sense of self and nationality.

In recent years intercultural contact has increased due to increasing levels of travel and migration, rapid advances in new technologies, and the globalisation of economies. Paradoxically, as people become increasingly connected, strong assertions of patriotism and nationalism are common, as if there is a fear that joining together will cause a loss of some aspect of identity (C. Bell, 1996; Cohen, 1982; Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995; Holton, 1998). Members of smaller nations in particular, experience dialectical tension or contradictory impulses (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996) between the desire to be part of globalisation and a desire to retain their own unique identity. To avoid the worst excesses of patriotism and nationalism, effective

intercultural communication is more important now than ever before (McDaniel, Samovar, & Porter, 2006).

Incongruously, culture is seen as enduring, relatively stable, and yet in a state of constant change (Lu & Kao, 2002), due in part to globalisation which has influenced the values of what were once stable cultures (Triandis, 1988 in Lu & Kao, 2002; Samovar & Porter, 2000). The globalisation of society and cultural imperialism by dominant cultures have been used to argue that cultural differences have been diluted (Hermans & Kempen, 1998). Cultural imperialism refers to the process by which cultural norms and values of large powerful nations influence smaller, less powerful nations through the pervasive effect of popular culture as evident, for example, in the exposure of many peoples to American films, books, music, and television, often in such a way as to provide less support for “home grown” examples of these products.

However, the predicted dilution of cultures through exposure to American popular culture is not having as great an effect on traditional cultures as expected. Lu and Kao (2002) found that the Taiwanese, for example, had adopted elements of Western values and practices while still retaining core elements of the traditional culture. This has relevance to the current study as themes of both the enduring and changing nature of culture are evident in the cultures of Australia and New Zealand where immigration of diverse groups and the increasing influence of American culture has led to change. These are discussed in chapter 4.

The media has been criticised for its role in presenting inaccurate views of cultural and national identity which are unquestioningly accepted by its viewers. Both agenda setting theory (McCombs, 2004; McCombs & Shaw, 1972) and cultivation theory (Gerbner, 1998) provide explanatory frameworks for how this occurs. Agenda setting theory suggests that the media tells the public not only what to think about, but how to think about it by transferring the importance of items on the news agenda to the agendas of consumers of mass media (McCombs, 2004; McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Similarly, cultivation theory predicts that individuals who are heavy television viewers will develop an exaggerated belief in the negative stereotypes of members of minority cultural and national groupings portrayed in the media (Gerbner, 1998).

Thus, the media plays an important communicative role in the social construction of reality which is analysed in discussions of this study's results in chapter 9.

### *Cultural Values Theory*

Theoretical studies in intercultural communication, particularly the theories relating to differences in the values between cultures developed by Hofstede, Triandis, and Edward Hall inform and deepen our analysis of cultural identity.

#### *Hofstede's Values Dimensions*

Hofstede's (1980, 2001) research on international differences in work-related values is, arguably, the most influential work on differences in values between cultures. The initial data came from IBM employees in 40 countries, including Australia and New Zealand, producing a total of 116,000 questionnaires. This study was later extended to cover 53 countries.

Hofstede's work was not about individuals but, rather, about the constraints within which people in different societies develop a sense of relatedness (Lu & Kao, 2002). It ranked countries values at a societal level rather than an individual level. Hofstede developed four main dimensions on which cultures differ, which are especially important for communication. These were labelled individualism, power distance, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance. Individualism referred to the extent to which individual or collective values were promoted. Power distance was the extent to which the less powerful members of a society accepted that power was distributed unevenly; masculinity, the extent to which power and assertiveness was valued in the culture; and uncertainty avoidance referred to the extent to which uncertainty and ambiguity were tolerated (Hofstede, 1980, 2001). Rankings for Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and Great Britain provided in Table 3.1 below indicate that Australia and New Zealand are similar although Australia was classified by Hofstede as more similar to the United States on individualism and power distance.



Table 3.1

*Hofstede's Cultural Values Scores and Rank out of 53 Countries for Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and Great Britain*

Country	Cultural Value							
	Individualism		Power distance		Masculinity		Uncertainty avoidance	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Aust	2	90	41	36	16	61	37	51
NZ	6	79	50	22	17	58	39=	49
US	1	91	38	40	15	62	43	46
GB	3	89	42=	35	9=	66	47=	35
Mean		43		57		49		65

Source: Derived from Hofstede (2001)

The individualism dimension, the extent to which the interests of the individual or the collective are promoted, is regarded as having the most influence on human values and behaviour. Individualistic cultures are those where values, rights and duties originate in the individual (Hofstede, 1980, 2001). These cultures emphasise individual initiative, independence and individual expression. This is contrasted with collectivist cultures where people are interdependent within their in-groups, give priority to the goals of their in-groups, shape their behaviour primarily on the basis of in-group norms, and behave in a communal way (Mill & Clark, 1982 in Triandis & Suh, 2002).

#### *Critique of Hofstede's values dimensions.*

Despite being used extensively for nearly 20 years Hofstede's work has recently been criticised (Eckhardt, 2002; Voronov & Singer, 2002). Voronov and Singer argued that Hofstede's work on the individualism dimension was methodologically flawed in several ways. They argued the sample, educated and skilled IBM workers, represented their countries to differing extents depending on the wealth of the country, with the greatest discrepancy being in third world countries. Maori, at the time Hofstede's data were collected, were not likely to have been well represented in the sample. New Zealand society itself contains allegiance to both individualism and collectivism. Common descriptors of Maori society accord with the collectivist end of the

individualist/collectivist continuum placing a high value on kinship ties, self-identifying according to tribal affiliation, having a strong sense of reciprocal responsibility for members of their extended family, and focusing on community through the *marae* (the area of land where the meeting house sits) (H. Mead, 2003; Patterson, 1992; R. Walker, 1989). However, Hofstede classified New Zealand as highly individualistic. Currently New Zealand governments are attempting to create policies which recognise both individualism and collectivism, for example, by allowing collective ownership of land, and giving tribal authorities (collectives) funding to manage training projects for unemployed members of their communities as well as paying individuals to undertake training.

Voronov and Singer (2002) also presented evidence that further studies comparing the Japanese and American cultures failed to replicate Hofstede's findings. They further argued that the questions Hofstede used to measure the concepts did not correspond with his definitions of individualism and collectivism, and that Hofstede's use of factor analysis was inappropriate as, although it indicated which items belonged together, it did not predict or explain the validity of a concept. Voronov and Singer contended that it was too simplistic to pigeonhole whole cultures, as subtle differences were glossed over and that, with increasing globalisation, such distinctions between cultures were becoming blurred. For example, for the concept of individualism the United States, Australia and New Zealand received very similar scores which may have summarised IBM employees, but which are not appropriate to describe the whole of their societies.

Similarly, Eckhardt (2002) argued that while Hofstede's work had had a huge impact on business thinking and provided an easily understood framework and appropriate introduction to the field, researchers and practitioners needed to go beyond Hofstede's work to appreciate fully the dynamic and complex nature of culture. Eckhardt maintained that Hofstede viewed cultural tendencies and values as inherently stable, a stance that was not supported by social science research. Triandis (1995; 2001) examined Hofstede's theory more deeply by differentiating between different kinds of individualism and collectivism.

### *Vertical and Horizontal Individualism*

Triandis refined Hofstede's theory to differentiate between vertical and horizontal individualism and vertical and horizontal collectivism. In vertical individualist cultures, of which the United States corporate culture is a prime example, competitiveness is high, and one must be "the best" in order to climb the hierarchy. In horizontal individualist cultures hierarchical differentiation is de-emphasised and the emphasis is on self-reliance, independence from others, and uniqueness (Triandis & Suh, 2002). Comparisons of individualism and collectivism reveal that in collectivist cultures there is a considerable distinction between in-groups and out-groups while individualistic cultures do not have such a strong distinction between the two. A study by Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai and Lucca (1988) noted that in collectivist cultures the in-group is usually fairly tight and is often limited to family, with the most direct relationships being vertical between parent and child. People in individualist cultures are most closely connected horizontally with spouses and friends rather than with parents and children and they belong to many more in-groups. In collectivist cultures, cooperation is high in in-groups but is unlikely when the other person belongs to an out-group (Triandis et al., 1988). In contrast, a horizontal form of individualism does not set up one group above another but makes it possible for people to interact with many more groups to create networks of equal hierarchy (Power, 2003).

The criticisms of Hofstede's individualism-collectivism continuum presented by Eckhardt (2002) and Voronov and Singer (2002) appear to have validity and some of the criticisms could equally apply to the other dimensions developed by Hofstede. Triandis' distinction between horizontal and vertical individualism more fully explains the similarities between the New Zealand and Australian cultures discussed in chapter 4. However, Hofstede's paradigm is useful as an initial theoretical framework to compare and contrast New Zealand and Australian culture because it has been so widely discussed in the literature. For example, the term collectivism has been applied to Maori culture (Patterson, 1992; Peszynski & Thanasankit, 2002; Pfeifer & Love, 2004), although these studies are not empirically based. Chapter 4 considers Australia and New Zealand cultures and Hofstede's cultural values in more detail.

Criticism that Hostede's individualism-collectivism continuum is an overgeneralisation and does not necessarily apply to individuals within a society also places Hall's (2000a) low-high context and monochronic–polychronic time distinctions (2000b) under scrutiny. However, they too provide useful theoretical frameworks for comparing and contrasting Australian and New Zealand cultures.

*Cultural Values Relating to Communication Styles and Time Orientation*

Cultures differ in their preferred communication styles and their attitudes to time. Hall (2000a) proposed that cultures differed in their preferred communication style with regard to the extent to which information was explicitly stated in the verbal message (low-context), or assumed to be shared, with very little of it coded into the explicit part of the message (high context). Members of high-context cultures spend a lot of time getting to know each other interpersonally and socially before any important transactions take place. For example as discussed in chapter 4, Maori are considered to be a high-context culture (Metge & Kinloch, 1978; Patterson, 1992) which, in a formal context, has elaborate and prolonged rituals of greeting, before getting down to business with people from outside their own community. On the other hand, members of low-context cultures, of which Anglo-Celtic Australian culture is an example, might merely extend a few words of welcome to visitors before starting on the scheduled business agenda. Like Hofstede, Hall presented these tendencies as a continuum. The concepts of context and individualism are considered to work in tandem, with individualistic cultures being low context and collectivist cultures being high-context (DeVito, O'Rourke, & O'Neill, 2000). Hall (2000b) also proposed distinctions between cultures with regards to their orientation towards time.

Time orientation has been described as either monochronic or polychronic (Hall, 2000b). Monochronic people or cultures (Western cultures, for example the United States, Germany and Switzerland) schedule one thing at a time and punctuality is valued. Time is compartmentalised as exemplified in the keeping of a diary and working towards deadlines. On the other hand, polychronic people and cultures (for example, Latin Americans, Mediterranean people and Arabs) schedule a number of things at the same time. Eating, conducting business with several different people, and taking care of family matters may all be conducted simultaneously. People from

polychronic cultures consider their family and interpersonal relationships more important than work commitments (Hall, 2000b). The interface of polychronic Maori culture with monochronic mainstream New Zealand culture is discussed in chapter 4.

While studies of international comparisons of preferred communication styles and time orientation have not been quantified in the way comparative measures of Hofstede's dimensions have been, Australia and New Zealand are broadly similar. The dominant culture of both countries is monochronic and low context, suggesting New Zealanders would adjust relatively easily to life in Australia.

The criticism that Hofstede's individualism-collectivism continuum (Eckhardt, 2002; Voronov & Singer, 2002) leads to a simplistic pigeonholing of whole cultures when considerable individual differences exist, could equally apply to Hall's proposed dimensions. However, because it provides a theoretical framework for comparing and contrasting cultures, it is useful to use Hall's work as an initial means of comparing New Zealand and Australian culture. Additional theoretical approaches are needed to provide a framework for this study of the relationship between New Zealand and Australian culture and the way New Zealanders adapt when they move to Australia. One such approach is provided by theories, discussed below, which elucidate why individuals tend to view their own culture and nation more positively than others. Another approach is provided by structuration theory.

### *Structuration Theory*

Giddens's structuration theory (1984) which emphasises roles, norms and relational expectations in communication networks gives an insight into how a society's dominant ethnic group's expectations of minority groups can limit the actions of members of minorities (Ellis, 1999). In turn these limiting expectations may become rules by which the members of the minority groups unconsciously live their lives. For example, the unconscious expectation of an employer that a minority group employee is not career oriented because of pre-conceived ideas about members of that minority group may become a self-fulfilling prophecy as the employee unconsciously conforms to the expected role. This study provides qualitative narrative data illustrating how the roles, norms, and relational expectations of some Maori New Zealanders change when they move to Australia.

### *National Identity*

National identity has been described as: “the institutionalized imagination of a self-proclaimed national community regarding its proper human and territorial boundaries, its cherished ideals and principles of action, and its rightful place in the community of nations” (Hymans, 2005, p. 315). Although individual members of a nation are acquainted with only a small proportion of the population they, to some degree, assume a shared identity with their countrymen and women. Anderson viewed a nation as “an imagined political community” and communities as distinguishable from one another “by the style in which they are imagined” (Anderson, 1991, p. 7). There is a close connection between cultural and national identity. National identity, like cultural identity, is part of personal identity (McDaniel et al., 2006; S. Taylor & Wetherell, 1995), and arouses deep emotional attachments (Anderson, 1991; Brewer, 1991; McLean, 2003).

Like cultural identity, national identity is complex and multi-faceted and changes over time so that it is more accurate to speak of national identities, as an acknowledgment of the multiculturalism present within most nations, than to assume a single, coherent identity (Holton, 1998). Paradoxically, concepts of national identity need coherence and consistency as by definition national identity involves a shared vision of society. Dixon (1999), in her discussion of Australian national identity responded to this dilemma by arguing that the dominant Anglo-Celtic identity is the one that binds Australian national identity and that members of the dominant group are accurate in advocating their values as those which define the nation.

National identity can incorporate beliefs and behaviours from a range of cultural groups that make up a nation. With reference to this study Maori and *Pakeha* are the main contributors to New Zealand’s national identity. It is recognised, however, that while there are shared elements in the New Zealand identity of Maori, *Pakeha* and indeed New Zealanders with, for example, Samoan, Tongan, Chinese, Taiwanese, or Korean cultural identities, members of different groups will regard different aspects of New Zealand national identity as more significant than others.

Concepts of national identity are partially “myth” (C. Bell, 1996; Ruth Brown, 1997), “invented” (R. White, 1981), or “imagined” (Anderson, 1991) out of evidence selected to fit an ideal, albeit not always consciously. White’s comment: “when we look at ideas about national identity, we need to ask, not whether they are true or false, but what their function is, whose creation they are, and whose interests they serve” (R. White, 1981, p. viii) leads to a discussion in chapter 9 of such functions, creations and interests and it is noted that most people construe their culture and their nation positively (S. Taylor, 1996). The theories which explain this positivism are discussed later in this chapter.

Nationalism is defined partly in comparison with other national groups and through perceived differences between national groups (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004). In order for national groups to survive they assert their differences in the maintenance of clear boundaries between themselves and others, particularly those closest to them (Barth, 1969, 1999; Brewer, 1991; Cohen, 1985, 1999a, 1982). Thus, nationalism incorporates “the desire to preserve and enjoy their own distinctive way of life” (Willmott, 1989, p. 2). Differences in cultural and national identity are maintained through boundary maintenance behaviour (Barth, 1969; Oliver, 2001, 2002) which involves making constant comparisons with other cultural or national groups. Thus, identity is not just about belonging; it is also about not belonging.

### Boundary Maintenance

National identity is a largely taken for granted attribute of the self when unchallenged in one’s home country, but at moments of crisis such as in war or natural disaster, at international sporting contests and when people are in a minority overseas it can become a central or defining feature. “People become aware of their culture when they stand at its boundaries” (Cohen, 1982, p. 3). Barth’s (1969) concept of boundary maintenance of national identity, most visible “at its boundary of difference” (Oliver, 2001, p. 5) with another *similar* culture, debated in discussions of similarity and difference between cultures (Oliver, 2001, 2002), helps explain the enduring nature of trans-Tasman rivalry. Oliver’s examination of Scottish nationalism, for example, revealed that those north of the border defined themselves, in part, by differences from the English, which created boundaries between Scottish and English identity (Oliver, 2001, 2002).

Cohen asserted that individuals were more influenced by local identity than by national identity “local experience mediates national identity, and ... understanding of the latter cannot proceed without knowledge of the former” (Cohen, 1982, p. 13). In Cohen’s view migrants from a provincial South Island town would have different perspectives on the concept of New Zealand identity from migrants from New Zealand’s largest city.

Individuals attribute positive or negative values to these differences between groups. Depending on the nature of the judgment the characteristic “is either strengthened and sustained, or ... deserted” (Cohen, 1982, p. 5). Thus identity is dynamic and constantly being reconstructed (Brewer, 1999; Oliver, 2001). The boundary of similarity and difference is not fixed but continually negotiated, reinforced or reappraised (Oliver, 2001) enriching and deepening cultural understanding in the process. Boundaries are marked by symbols. The meaning of these symbols varies depending on whether they are conferred by group members or outsiders. When conferred by outsiders these symbols can become unwanted stereotypes (Oliver, 2001).

Boundaries are relational, simultaneously connecting and separating one side from another (Jenkins, 1996). Paradoxically, the presence of a boundary is both a barrier and at the same time sets the process of connection in progress (Barth, 1999). For example, Australians and New Zealanders consciously form trade and military alliances that both confirm the boundaries and yet span them by creating bridges across which communication can flow, deals can be negotiated and agreements reached.

Peripheral communities operating at the fringes of society, such as the rural British communities examined by Cohen (1982), exhibit a fierce desire to maintain their distinctive identity. Peripherality is not limited to geographically isolated communities but includes groups who feel they are marginal because their existence is threatened by competing identities. For groups on the periphery, the boundary between themselves and others is fundamental to their identity, and they bolster their self-image by viewing their own culture as superior to that of the more dominant



society. Part of Scottish identity, for example, involves viewing Scotland as peripheral to England and as “weaker ... dependent [and] exploited ... [but] the repository of the more authentic and substantial values” (Cohen, 1999b, p. 149). The belief in the superiority of Scottish identity continues when Scots migrate to England and is accompanied by a strong commitment to retaining their distinct national identity (Condor, 2005). Thus “peripheral vision” was an important part of Scottish national identity and peripherality central to an understanding of Scottishness. Cohen (1999a, p. 12) also stated it is “the boundary condition of peripheral societies that their gaze is simultaneously outward and introspective”. This means that peripheral societies, for example Scotland, look to societies they consider themselves peripheral to, for example England, in order to define themselves. Thus Scotland is defined in terms of how it is different from England.

Geographically isolated with a population of only four million New Zealand is what Cohen (1999a; 1999b) calls a “peripheral society”. New Zealand is linked with Australia in the eyes of the rest of the world as many of its economic and political activities involve working with Australia. This study explores how New Zealanders on both sides of the Tasman maintain the boundaries of their national identity with Australia, to see if New Zealanders can be said to define themselves by difference as the Scots do, and to determine if there are differences in the boundary maintenance behaviour of the two groups. The peripherality of New Zealand society contributes towards New Zealand’s fierce patriotism (Stewart & Harvey, 2003). Processes of globalisation and global media outlets, which place pressure on communities to conform, lead to a reasserting of symbolic boundaries.

#### Explanations for Positive National and Cultural Identity

As evident in the project one interviews, individuals tend to view their own culture and nation positively and other cultures and nations negatively (Tajfel, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; S. Taylor, 1996). Concepts from social identity theory, optimal distinctiveness theory, and cognitive dissonance theory, are used to analyse these perceptions.

### *Social Identity Theory*

Social psychological theories of social identity such as Tajfel and Turner's social identity theory provide a framework useful in explaining why individuals attribute positive characteristics to the groups they belong to and negative characteristics to the groups they do not belong to. Social identity theory suggests that people are positively biased towards members of their own group because individuals primarily define themselves in terms of social group membership and seek a positive identity or self-definition with reference to social groups (Rupert Brown, 2000; Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In making their decisions about their social identity, individuals exaggerate differences between groups and similarities within groups, thus increasing differences between a person's in-group and other out-groups. Evaluating one's own group positively and other groups negatively contributes to the positive self-identity of an individual. Thus, as is evident in the project one interviews, New Zealanders would be expected to see themselves in terms of positive characteristics shared with other New Zealanders and to claim differences from Australian culture.

While social identity theory has broadly influenced the field of inter-group relations, it does not cover all inter-group situations. There may, for example, be more than one out-group and there may be occasions where group members will view the out-group as superior on some dimensions and inferior on other dimensions (Deaux, 2000). In addition, social identity theory does not distinguish between different kinds of groups. In-group favouritism is thought to apply equally to large scale groupings, such as religion or ethnicity, and to smaller scale groupings, such as work or sporting teams. The social context of the interaction (Liu, Wilson, McClure, & Higgins, 1999), and situations where an individual simultaneously holds multiple social identities (Rupert Brown, 2000), as is the case with Maori living in Australia who identify both as Maori and New Zealanders, are also not well covered by social identity theory. However, optimal distinctiveness theory discussed below does take simultaneous multiple identities into account.

The study of immigration offers important insights into inter-group relations (Deaux, 2000; Dovidio & Esses, 2001), and social identity theory which provides a useful framework for the assignment of positive and negative characteristics in inter-group comparisons aids an understanding of the views expressed by the current study's

participants through examination of the “in-groups” and “out-groups” of New Zealanders when they live in Australia. Specifically this study examines: first, if New Zealand migrants to Australia see themselves as an in-group with more positive characteristics than their out-groups - stayers and Australians; second, if those who stayed in New Zealand describe themselves more positively than those who have moved to Australia, or Australians themselves; and third, if New Zealand migrants in Australia express more dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand than stayers.

### *Optimal Distinctiveness Theory*

Project one interviewees reported an enhanced loyalty towards New Zealand while living in Australia. Optimal distinctiveness theory provides a framework for understanding why positive assertions of national identity are often stronger when people are away from their homeland (Brewer, 1991, 1999). Altrocchi and Altrocchi in a study of the acculturation of Cook Island Maori, for example, found that those who had migrated to New Zealand were heavily involved in Cook Island activities and more devoted to Cook Island ways than those in Rarotonga, the country’s most westernised island (Altrocchi & Altrocchi, 1995). Altrocchi and Altrocchi concluded that being away from their cultural origins and surrounded by another culture led Cook Islanders to reaffirm and reemphasise the traditions of their homeland (Altrocchi & Altrocchi, 1995).

Optimal distinctiveness theory predicts group identity would be stronger among members of a minority than majority group. Brewer (1991) suggests “distinctiveness” is a fundamental human need, necessary for self-definition. However, individuals also have a conflicting need for assimilation, derived from the opposing forces of the need for inclusion and the need for differentiation.

Simultaneous multiple group identities combine to satisfy both differentiation and inclusion needs. The desire for belonging motivates immersion in social groups, however, when belongingness is experienced, the need for differentiation is activated. Individuals therefore select group identities that are inclusive enough to create the feeling of being part of a larger collective, but exclusive enough to provide some basis for distinctiveness from others (Brewer, 1991, 1999). For example, New Zealanders in their homeland might use their professional identity to give them a sense of

distinctiveness because their national identity would not sufficiently differentiate them from others. However in Australia, their national identity might become more important than their professional identity where being a New Zealander would allow them to belong to a familiar group while allowing them to distinguish themselves from Australians.

Optimal distinctiveness theory suggests that living in Australia would increase New Zealanders' patriotism and sense of New Zealand identity.

The theory suggests that in-group identity and loyalty will be achieved more easily for minority groups than for majority groups, and that biases in favour of the in-group increase as the relative size of the in-group in comparison to the out-group decreases, as group loyalty is strongest among groups that simultaneously provide for a sense of belonging and a sense of distinctiveness (Brewer, 1991).

There has been empirical support for Brewer's theory (Vignoles, Chryssochoou, & Breakwell, 2000), however, the need for distinctiveness takes a different form in collectivist cultures from that in individualistic cultures (Vignoles et al., 2000). In addition, the optimum size of in-groups relative to out-groups is not clear (Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2002). Despite this, optimal distinctiveness theory gives a focus for an examination of the effect of migration on an individual's national identity.

Accordingly, this study explores whether New Zealanders living in Australia saw themselves as more patriotic with a stronger sense of national identity than they had when they lived in New Zealand.

### *Cognitive Dissonance Theory*

Differences in the way members of different social groups perceive themselves and each other can also be explained by cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957). Dissonance is an uncomfortable mental state which occurs when people are exposed to information inconsistent with their beliefs, leaving them motivated to reduce such dissonance. This can be done in a number of ways, including seeking out new information which supports their beliefs, by ignoring or downplaying information which does not fit their views, or by changing their views. Information so used can be about oneself, another person or group or about things and events in the environment.

Cognitive dissonance theory, one of the most influential theories in social psychology since its introduction nearly 50 years ago, has generated a huge number of studies and been applied to a wide variety of psychological topics (Harmon-Jones & Mills, 1999). It has however been criticised for its complexity, for being untestable as Festinger (1957) did not specify a reliable way of assessing the degree of dissonance an individual experienced, and there is controversy over the underlying motivation causing the dissonance (Harmon-Jones & Mills, 1999). Other theorists attempted to avoid using Festinger's ideas about cognitive dissonance and proposed alternative ways of explaining how people's attitudes and behaviours seem to need to be congruent. Aronson (in Harmon-Jones & Mills, 1999) considered individuals rationalised inconsistencies because they wanted to appear reasonable to themselves. Cooper (in Harmon-Jones & Mills, 1999) argued that attitude change was the result of feeling personally responsible for negative consequences, while Bem (in Harmon-Jones & Mills, 1999) claimed that individuals simply observed their behaviour and changed their attitudes to fit the observed behaviour. However, while there is debate over the cause of dissonance there is agreement that individuals experience dissonance when their beliefs and attitudes are threatened by inconsistent information or behaviour on the part of others or themselves, and that they do seek to explain themselves and their actions. Thus if a New Zealand migrant did not like Australia cognitive dissonance theory would suggest that they will go home or they will change their attitudes and say "I stayed because I like it here now. It gets better over time".

As explored more fully in the next chapter, New Zealanders typically have a very positive view of their homeland (C. Bell, 1996). At the same time, large numbers of New Zealanders chose to migrate to other countries, notably Australia (Bedford, 2001; Bushnell & Choy, 2001). This study explores how migrants rationalise this apparent inconsistency and how stayers justify and rationalise the apparent inconsistency of family members deciding to leave New Zealand and move to Australia, and their own decision to remain in their homeland.

#### Conclusion and Research Questions Arising From Social Construction of Identity Literature

As demonstrated in the current study of New Zealand migrants to Australia, an individual's social identity is complex, multi-faceted, and constantly evolving.

Cultural and national identity, developed through social interactions with others makes up an important part of an individual's social identity. Individuals, in part, define themselves according to what they are not, thus comparisons with other groups (out-groups), which tend to be viewed less positively than groups an individual belongs to (in-groups), form an integral part of identity development and change.

Concepts such as the multi-faceted and changing nature of identity, introduced in this chapter are related to a detailed discussion of New Zealanders' cultural and national identity in chapter 4, and in chapter 5, which examines theories and studies of migration and transnationalism, to how social identity becomes more complex when an individual has migrated to another country.

This thesis examines how New Zealanders adapt and change when they live in Australia, how New Zealanders view themselves in relation to Australians, how they maintain the boundaries of their national identity when they live in a similar culture, whether they view their own groups more positively than other groups, and how they justify their decision to migrate from or stay in New Zealand. Specific research questions that arose and that this study further explores in projects two and three through surveys with migrants and stayers and interviews with stayers are listed below. They are derived from a synthesis of the literature and issues raised by initial interviews with migrants, and analysis of the migrant interviews in relation to the concepts provided in the literature.

1. In what ways do New Zealanders living in Australia evoke symbols of New Zealand identity and what is their function (Shweder, 1991)? (Project one)
2. What do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia suggest about how New Zealanders adapt and change when they live in Australia (Abrams et al., 2003)? (Project one)
3. How do the roles, norms, and expectations of Maori New Zealanders change when they move to Australia (Ellis, 1999)? (Project one)
4. What do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia suggest about how New Zealanders maintain the boundaries of their national identity when living in a similar culture (Barth, 1969, 1999; Cohen, 1999b, 1982)? (Project one)

5. How do these narratives compare with the way New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand maintain the boundaries of their national identity with Australia (Barth, 1969, 1999; Cohen, 1999b, 1982)? (Projects one and three)
6. To what extent will New Zealand migrants to Australia see themselves as an in-group with more positive characteristics than their out-groups, those who have stayed behind and Australians (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986)? (Project one)
7. Will those who stayed in New Zealand describe themselves more positively than those who have gone to Australia or, indeed, Australians (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986)? (Project three)
8. Will New Zealand migrants to Australia construct a different view of themselves and New Zealand in comparison to stayers (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986)? (Projects one and three)
9. Will migrants express more dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand than stayers (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986)? (Projects one and three)
10. Will New Zealanders living in Australia see themselves as more patriotic with a stronger sense of national identity than they had when they lived in New Zealand (Brewer, 1991, 1999)? (Project one)
11. In what ways will migrants rationalise their decision to move from a country with many positive features and how will stayers rationalise the decision of family members to move to Australia, and their own decision to remain in their homeland (Festinger, 1957)? (Projects one and three)

## **Chapter 4: Literature Review Two: New Zealand's Cultural and National Identity**

In this chapter New Zealanders' constructions of their cultural and national identity and their comparisons of themselves with Australians are examined in the light of theories relating to the social construction of identity discussed in chapter 3. The nature of New Zealand, Maori, and Australian identity is explored to provide a context for an examination of how New Zealanders' sense of identity adapts and changes when living in Australia. The cultures of New Zealand and Australia are compared from academic and popular culture viewpoints, providing a framework for an analysis of New Zealand migrant perceptions of their identity in Australia. Cultural values theory such as Hofstede's values continua (1980; 2001) and Triandis' refinement of these (Triandis, 1995, 2001; Triandis et al., 1988; Triandis & Suh, 2002) provide frameworks for this discussion. In addition, an account is given of economic and political trans-Tasman relations.

While New Zealanders have a very positive view of their homeland (C. Bell, 1996) and express high levels of satisfaction with life in New Zealand, large numbers of New Zealanders currently live outside their homeland (estimated at 600-700,000 or more than 15% of New Zealand's population) (Bedford, 2001), about two-thirds of them in Australia (Bushnell & Choy, 2001). Both Maori and *Pakeha* New Zealanders are moving to Australia in large numbers and at the rate of about 600 a week in 2006 (Collins, 2006, March 21; Statistics New Zealand, 2006b). This study investigates why New Zealanders migrate to Australia, despite having such positive views of their country, and examines how they adapt and change as a result of living in Australia. An examination of the cultural and national identity of New Zealanders and the extent to which Australians and New Zealanders share a common cultural identity aids these investigations.

Samovar and Porter's description of culture as made up of "knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, social hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relationships, [and] concepts of the universe ... acquired ... in the course of generations through individual and group striving" (Samovar & Porter, 2000, p. 7) provides a framework for examining the cultures of New Zealand and Australia,



which share many similarities, including their educational and legal systems, and religious backgrounds. Indeed, to many, such as the British and the Americans, Australians and New Zealanders often appear indistinguishable. However, through a process of boundary maintenance (Barth, 1969; Oliver, 2001, 2002) New Zealanders claim a cultural identity distinctly different from that of Australia (Catley, 2001c) and vigorously defend their distinctiveness. Although Australians and New Zealanders describe themselves as having much more in common with each other than they do with any other nationalities (McLean, 2001), the idea of a single Antipodean culture is adamantly rejected, as is evident in the following summary statement from Denis McLean, former New Zealand ambassador to the United States: “New Zealand will not give up its independence for a subordinate bit part in a federal system centered on Canberra” (McLean, 2003, p. 304).

Concepts of national identity are partially “myth” (C. Bell, 1996; Ruth Brown, 1997), “invented” (R. White, 1981), or “imagined” (Anderson, 1991) out of evidence unconsciously selected to fit an ideal. White’s comment that when looking at concepts of national identity it is not important to ask whether they are true or false but “what their function is, whose creation they are, and whose interests they serve” (R. White, 1981, p. viii) leads to a discussion of such functions, creations and interests.

#### New Zealand Cultural and National Identity

Considering New Zealanders’ view of their cultural and national identity is a starting point for an examination of the changes and adaptations to their sense of identity when they live in Australia. Because of the multifaceted and complex nature of New Zealand identity academics argue that it is more appropriate to talk about New Zealand identities than a single New Zealand identity (Liu, McCreanor, McIntosh, & Teaiwa, 2005). It is argued that discussions of New Zealand identity privilege the dominant group – white New Zealanders of British heritage – at the expense of other groups and that the identities of minority groups such as Maori, Pacific Islanders, and those with Asian backgrounds must be considered in any assertions regarding cultural and national identity. As previously noted, New Zealand has two main cultural groupings, Maori and *Pakeha*, with differing identities (King, 1991; Patterson, 1992; R. Walker, 1989; A. Webster & Perry, 2003). In addition, as the number of immigrants, especially those of Asian backgrounds, has increased (in 2001 27.5% of

the overseas born had lived in New Zealand for less than five years, and since 1986 the biggest growth in migrants has been from Asian countries; (Statistics New Zealand, 2001; Zodgekar, 2005), attention has increasingly been focused on the effect of immigration on the nature of New Zealand identity (Liu et al., 2005; Spoonley, Macpherson, & Pearson, 2004). The accommodation of the ethnic identity of migrants from Asian and other non-Caucasian groups is the subject of ongoing debate in relation to how to describe ethnic identity, who qualifies as a “true” New Zealander, and the effect rapid immigration has had on New Zealand identity (Dupais, Hughes, Lauder, & Strathdee, 1999; Liu et al., 2005; U. Walker, 2001; Zodgekar, 2005).

However, the fact that many groups contribute to New Zealand society does not preclude the development of a shared identity based upon existing traditions but modified by subsequent waves of migration. Applying to concepts of New Zealand identity an argument similar to Dixon’s (1999) claim that it was the Anglo-Celtic aspects of Australian life that provided a cohesive sense of identity for the whole culture, the features of New Zealand culture stemming from and identified by the Anglo-Celtic majority, combined with certain aspects of Maori culture, underpin New Zealand identity.

Project one examined the experiences of Maori and *Pakeha* New Zealanders in Australia as they are the major groups of New Zealanders that migrate to Australia<sup>9</sup>. This was because New Zealanders with, for example, Pacific Island, Asian, or South African origins may have dual cultural and national identities. Despite influences on the national identity from migrants to New Zealand from Asia and the Pacific, certain defining characteristics of a base New Zealand identity are still evident in the popular consciousness, and it is these that are discussed below in the knowledge that they were derived from the culture and serve the interests of the dominant *Pakeha* group in New Zealand society, and over time will be adapted and changed.

New Zealanders, along with most cultural and national groups, have a largely positive concept of their collective identity. New Zealanders have referred to their homeland

---

<sup>9</sup> The Ministry of Maori Development, Te Puni Kokiri (2004) claimed that 72,954 Maori lived in Australia, a higher figure than Australian immigration estimates (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003) as it included Australian-born with Maori ancestry.

as “God’s Own Country” (later shortened to “Godzone”) after Richard John Seddon, New Zealand’s Premier from 1893 to 1906, repeatedly referred to New Zealand in this way (J. Phillips, 2005), and generations of New Zealanders grew up believing in their country’s superiority to other countries (C. Bell, 1996). These beliefs served to bolster the pride and confidence of a people living in a small isolated country far away from centres of power and influence.

While these characteristics are partially myth (C. Bell, 1996; Ruth Brown, 1997) frequently cited defining characteristics of [*Pakeha*] New Zealand identity include an egalitarianism (King, 1991) accompanied by dislike of formality and criticism of people perceived to be ‘too big for their boots’ (“tall poppy syndrome”) (Mouly & Sankaran, 2000, 2002), and a rural, pioneering heritage (Sinclair, 1986). New Zealanders describe themselves as practical, down to earth do-it-yourselfers for whom anything is possible using a bit of “Kiwi ingenuity” (Ruth Brown, 1997). New Zealand is considered a clean, green, rural paradise (C. Bell, 1996; Ruth Brown, 1997), and a “great” place to bring up children (Ruth Brown, 1997). New Zealanders consider themselves hard workers, the combined result of being populated by only the highest quality immigrants and the need to work hard to tame the land (Sinclair, 1986). Sport is highly valued. In addition, the influence of Maori culture on all New Zealanders is part of what distinguishes New Zealand identity from other Western cultures (Masters, 2004, February 28; J. Phillips, 1996b). These characteristics are now explored in more depth.

### *Egalitarianism*

Egalitarianism was the favoured ideological myth of [*Pakeha*] New Zealand identity up to the 1950s and 1960s, as contrasted with a more hierarchical British society during colonial times (C. Bell, 1996; King, 1991; McLean, 2003; Willmott, 1989). As an index of gender equality, New Zealand was the first country in the world to give women the vote (Australia was the second), and is one of the few to have had two successive women prime ministers. The relative absence of a British-type class system appealed to settlers who considered it possible to achieve identity and status on the basis of what they did rather than on the circumstances of their birth (C. Bell, 1996). The view, expressed by King (1991) of New Zealand as a place where social justice and opportunity were possible, inculcated by schools and parents, was widely

accepted by *Pakeha* New Zealanders in the 1950s and 1960s (C. Bell, 1996). “New Zealand was a nation that exemplified the principle that people ought to succeed or fail on their merits rather than on their genealogy, and that it was a society that protected its weakest members” (King, 1991 p. 12). New Zealanders’ dislike of formality and the “tall poppy syndrome” of wanting to cut down to size successful members of society perceived as being “too big for their boots”, can be traced to this sense of egalitarianism. The egalitarian myth has faded in recent years, with many New Zealanders recognising that there are advantaged and disadvantaged groups in New Zealand society (C. Bell, 1996). In particular, it has been recognised that Maori have been disadvantaged educationally and economically (Durie, 1995; McIntosh, 2005; R. Walker, 1989; S. Webster, 1993; Willmott, 1989) relative to other New Zealanders, destroying the “we are one people” myth which prevailed among *Pakeha* from the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand’s founding document, in 1840, to the 1960s (King, 2003).

*Connection to the Land/Outdoor, Rural Heritage and Strong Work Ethic*

The myth of New Zealand as “clean, green and beautiful” (C. Bell, 1996, p. 28) or a “clean, green, pastoral paradise” (Ruth Brown, 1997, p. 3) with outstanding natural resources has been evident throughout New Zealand’s history. When New Zealand was being promoted in Britain by Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s New Zealand Company from the late 1830s onwards (Belich, 1996), it was portrayed as a land of outstanding natural resources and fertility, and thus a land of opportunity. Early settlers purchased land for small sums and set about clearing and farming it, and “the happy rural family working together in the natural environment ... is the central strand of legends and mythology of *Pakeha* New Zealand” (C. Bell, 1997, p. 145). The early New Zealand pioneer-in-nature myth implied a strong work ethic and a moral wholesomeness supposedly absent in towns or cities. New Zealand’s national image, developed from a time when its early settlers worked hard to tame the land, was based, in part, on the belief that New Zealand was settled by only the “best colonising stock”, with no taint of convict origins (Sinclair, 1986, p. 12).

Many New Zealanders now living in the cities look to a “rural colonial experiment for their roots” (Sinclair, 1986, p.6). Part of the New Zealand psyche is a pride in New Zealand’s “clean air and open spaces”, and many *Pakeha* have fond memories of a

childhood in which they enjoyed family holidays in rural areas and were free to roam around the countryside (King, 1991). Indeed, part of the sense of being *Pakeha* has been related to a feeling of affinity with the land (King, 1991). Triandis and Suh argued that climate influenced culture, citing studies which demonstrated violence was more prevalent in warm climates than in cold or extremely hot climates (Van de Vliert et al., 1999, in Triandis & Suh, 2002). Matthewman considered that weather, like the land, was a powerful aspect of shared identity which helped to forge a sense of New Zealand national identity. Idealised descriptions of New Zealand's climate were used to lure migrants to New Zealand, and, Matthewman considered summer and beach-going was a defining feature of New Zealand identity (2001). Currently, the image of New Zealand as clean, green, and beautiful (C. Bell, 1996; Ruth Brown, 1997) is evident too in the way New Zealand is marketed to tourists and in advertising for its primary produce (Ministry for the Environment, 2001; New Zealand Tourism Online, 2006).

The myth New Zealand is “a great place to bring up children” (Ruth Brown, 1997, p. 3) is connected with the image of New Zealand as a “clean, green, paradise” as is evident in the following quotation from a newspaper article; “if we’re known for anything overseas, it’s for sporting success, for being ‘clean and green’ and ... for being ‘a great place to bring up children’” (Bale, 2001, April 27, para. 3), although this has been questioned in recent years (Bale, 2001, April 27; Beatson, 2006, March 15; Goff, 1996, September 6). Part of the image New Zealand presents to the world is its concern for the environment, which since 1984 has been linked to its nuclear-free policy.

### *Practical, Down to Earth, Do-it-Yourselfers*

Many New Zealanders describe themselves as practical, down to earth do-it-yourselfers who consider anything is possible with a bit of “Kiwi ingenuity”. The latter, evoked with reference to “the ability to fix anything with a piece of number eight fencing wire” (Ruth Brown, 1997, p. 8), is a powerful myth of New Zealand identity which draws on both Maori and *Pakeha* tradition (Ruth Brown, 1997). An example of this was Edmund Hillary and a New Zealand team who, in 1958, reached the South Pole 16 days before the British group that set out at the same time. The British had purpose-built equipment, while the New Zealanders had modified Massey

Ferguson farm tractors. References to fencing wire and Massey Ferguson tractors emphasise a masculine concept of New Zealand identity (J. Phillips, 1996a). In the 1960s, this masculine culture was centred on rugby, racing, and beer although this view is not as prevalent today (J. Phillips, 2005).

### *Importance of Sport*

Sporting involvement, which is linked to the male-dominated outdoor image, is highly valued in New Zealand society and is accompanied by an under-valuing of intellectual pursuits (J. Phillips, 1996a). Generations of (male) New Zealanders have taken an active part in sporting activities and revered sporting heroes. Rugby union, New Zealand's national sport, has a particular place in the New Zealand psyche and has been described as a national religion (C. Bell, 1996; J. Phillips, 1996a).

### *A Nation of Travellers*

It is often said that New Zealand is a "country of immigrants" (Bedford, 2003, p. 1). The opening sentence of King's book on New Zealand identity states: "In the beginning we were all immigrants to these islands, our ancestors boat people who arrived by *waka* [Maori canoe], ship or aeroplane" (King, 1991, p. 9). Much has been made of New Zealand being populated by adventurous, hard-working and courageous individuals willing to risk all by making a one-way trip to a faraway destination (Sinclair, 1986). For later generations, the overseas experience (OE) became an important rite of passage for young New Zealanders (Conradson & Latham, 2005; Lidgard & Gilson, 2002), who were encouraged to travel and "see the world" before returning and settling down. Thus, even though New Zealand is considered a good place to live, it is part of young New Zealanders' personal development to broaden their horizons by going somewhere else to live and work.

### *ANZAC Tradition*

New Zealanders recognise both the Gallipoli experience and the ANZAC (Australian and New Zealand Army Corps) tradition as formative in their national identity (Sinclair, 1986). The way New Zealand and Australian troops performed in the first and second world wars has been a powerful myth of New Zealand identity and stories of colonial superiority through outperforming troops from Britain and other European countries bolstered national pride. Experiences fighting together in overseas wars

created a connection between Australia and New Zealand as they came of age together. The creation of the ANZAC myth enhanced the symbolism of the huge losses sustained in war by both Australia and New Zealand. A sense of identity grew out of their Gallipoli experience because both New Zealanders and Australians were clearly identified as national troops, albeit in support of the British.

The ANZAC tradition has become less important with the passage of time, as was highlighted by Allan Hawke when he was appointed Australian High Commissioner to New Zealand in 2003. Hawke considered that trans-Tasman ties were at a crossroads due to weakened ANZAC links, which he attributed to leaders whose views were forged by the first and second world wars handing over to a new generation for whom the ANZAC tradition was not as important (Harvey, 2003).

#### *Independence and Dislike of Domination*

In common with other small nations overshadowed by more powerful nations on the world stage, New Zealanders are fiercely independent and resist attempts at domination. For example the New Zealand public supported the then Prime Minister David Lange's nuclear-free policy after 1984 when they considered the United States was attempting to bully New Zealand into accepting their nuclear powered or armed vessels in New Zealand ports by imposing trade and diplomatic sanctions (Willmott, 1989).

#### *Challenges to Positive Images of New Zealand Identity*

Although New Zealanders have a largely positive concept of their collective identity, some inadequacies are made public (C. Bell, 1996). New Zealanders are sometime said to lack self-confidence, be self-deprecating and overly concerned about what others think of them (McCreanor, 2005; Mitchell, 1972). They have been described as dour and drab due to the effect of the Scottish Calvinism of many of the settlers (McLauchlan, 1976). They are also seen as critical of others, particularly "tall poppies" (successful members of society). In addition, since the 1970s Maori have challenged *Pakeha* to re-examine their perspective on race relations in New Zealand (Awatere, 1984; C. Bell, 1996; R. Walker, 1987).

*Influence of Maori Culture on New Zealand Identity*

Maori were New Zealand's first settlers arriving in a series of migrations from East Polynesia about 800 years ago (King, 2003). Spasmodic contact with Europeans began after the establishment of a British penal colony at Port Jackson in 1788, as parts of New Zealand were used as temporary bases for sealing, whaling, timber and flax expeditions (Sinclair, 1986). By the late 1830s European contact was increasing, and the settlement of traders, missionaries, ex-convicts and entrepreneurs had begun. New Zealand was seen as a potential British colony. Increasing settlement and loss of Maori land led in 1840 to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi between representatives of the British crown New Zealand and Maori chiefs. New Zealand became a British colony with George Grey, former governor of New South Wales as first governor (Orange, 1992).

A defining aspect of being a New Zealander is the influence of Maori concepts, values, language and relationships. Maori make up 15% (Statistics New Zealand, 2006a) of New Zealand's population and, despite being tribal, have a collective presence. Prior to the 1970s New Zealand prided itself on being a model of race relations, with the phrase "we are one people" summing up this myth of New Zealand identity. However, Maori protest about unresolved Treaty grievances in the 1970s, in the form of land marches and the occupation of tribal land which had become Crown land, cast doubt on the myth of racial harmony, and the Waitangi Tribunal was set up in 1975 to provide a legal process by which Maori Treaty claims could be investigated (Waitangi Tribunal, 2006).

Since the 1980s a policy of biculturalism has been pursued, with successive governments attempting to honour the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand's founding document (Liu et al., 1999; Orange, 1992; Williams, 1996). Maori became an official language after the Maori Language Act was passed in 1987 (Karetu & Waite, 1988), and by 2006 \$707 million had been paid in compensation to Maori tribes (Office of Treaty Settlements, 2006).

The upsurge of interest and pride in Maori culture since the mid-1970s has affected all New Zealanders, so that few lack a basic understanding of Maori cultural values or a smattering of understanding of Maori words. Even before this, however, Maori



culture was a part of mainstream New Zealand culture (King, 2003; J. Phillips, 1996b), to the extent that New Zealanders referred to their country as Maoriland in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century (J. Phillips, 2005). Symbols of Maori identity have long been used to signify New Zealand identity; the most obvious being the All Blacks' (New Zealand's national rugby union team) performance of a Maori *haka* prior to international rugby fixtures. The acceptance of Maori culture was also evident on the many occasions when groups of *Pakeha* New Zealanders living overseas have performed impromptu *haka* or renditions of *Po Karekare Ana*, a popular Maori song, to signify their New Zealand identity (King, 1991; Masters, 2004, February 28). However, the symbolic significance of the performance of the *haka* is contested, with some arguing that it represents the inappropriate appropriation of a Maori tradition (Murray, 2000).

New Zealanders differ in the extent to which they embrace Maori culture and accept biculturalism (Liu et al., 1999; Sibley & Liu, 2004). Many New Zealanders, for example, are opposed to government policy, which since 1986 has, in many areas of legislation, included a requirement that the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi be taken into account. Those holding this view argue such policies mean Maori have special privileges that advantage them at the expense of other New Zealanders (Sibley & Liu, 2004). A speech by Don Brash, leader of the New Zealand National Party, in the lead-up to the 2005 general election, which argued that the government's policies had led to a "dangerous drift towards racial separatism in New Zealand" (Brash, 2004, para. 7) coincided with a major surge in the polls for the National Party, and although they did not win the 2005 general election the National Party gained more of the vote than they had at the previous two elections, winning 48 out of 121 seats (compared with 27 seats in 2002), marginally behind Labour, which won 51 seats.

It has been proposed that those with conservative views on race relations might see immigration to Australia as a way of resolving their dissatisfaction with New Zealand's race relations policies. They may see Australians as more like themselves, and Australia as more reflective of their values than present day New Zealand (Carmichael, 1993; Tilbury, 1999), and this view was asserted by some project one interviewees.

As it is apparent that aspects of Maori culture have been incorporated into New Zealand's majority culture, and indeed some commentators argue that Maori have given New Zealand a sense of identity (King, 1991; Masters, 2004, February 28), any discussion of the cultural identity of New Zealanders needs to consider the effect of Maori cultural identity on the country as a whole.

Just as it is acknowledged that no singular New Zealand identity exists, the same applies to Maori identity (Borell, 2005; McIntosh, 2005). Before European contact there was no concept of Maori identity. Maori thought of themselves in terms of *iwi* (tribes, the basic unit of Maori society), and the word *maori* meant normal or usual (Fitzgerald et al., 2000; R. Walker, 1989). While traditional aspects of Maori culture have been romanticised and pre-European Maori culture has tended to be viewed as a fixed ideal, Maori culture was in fact in a constant state of adaptation in pre-European times and has, inevitably, undergone many more changes as a result of contact with the *Pakeha* (Metge, 1964). Migration to the cities from the 1950s onwards led to further adaptation and change, and many contemporary urban Maori have little or no contact with their *iwi* (Durie, 1995; McIntosh, 2005; S. Webster, 1993). Today, Maori differ in the extent to which they identify with traditional Maori values and beliefs, as was noted by the *Te Hoe Nuku Roa* Research Team, which was conducting a longitudinal study of Maori households:

Far from being homogenous Maori individuals have a variety of cultural characteristics and live in a number of cultural and socio-economic realities. The relevance of so called traditional values is not the same for all Maori ... Maori society is not static ... It is both dynamic and interactive. (Fitzgerald et al., 2000, p. 11)

Both rural and urban Maori have taken certain aspects of "traditional" Maori identity and adapted them to suit their social environment (McIntosh, 2005). Nevertheless, certain aspects of Maori culture have endured over the years, albeit in adapted forms.

Distinctive features of Maori culture include its oral tradition, tribal make-up (Rangihau, 1975), the communal nature of traditional life (Metge, 1964), a close spiritual relationship with the land (Sinclair, 1986), and respect for elders (Patterson, 1992). Patterson (1992) who examined the values embedded in Maori proverbs and traditional narratives argued that kinship was central to Maori culture and that this

included a wide network of connections as well as close blood relations. Collective responsibility and collective achievement was central to Maori life (Patterson, 1992) as membership of an extended family carried rights and responsibilities (Dansey, 1975). *Whakapapa*, the Maori term for genealogy, provides the link between the people of today and the people of the past.

Maori have a close spiritual relationship with the land stemming from their traditional concept of the origin of humanity deriving from the loving union of the earth-mother, *Papa-tu-a-nuku*, with the sky-father, *Rangi-nui-e-tu-nei*. For example, a person's *turangawaewae*, translated as "place to stand", is their ancestral land and gives Maori a sense of identity or belonging (H. Mead, 2003). This word has become part of common usage in mainstream New Zealand. For example, it was used by the Department of Statistics in the theme song to promote the 2001 census (Statistics New Zealand, 2002a), and was part of the theme for New Zealand's 2006 Race Relations Day activities (New Zealand History Online, 2006).

Maori attachment to the land is evident in Maori referring to themselves as *tangata whenua*, people of the land. The burial of the placenta of newborn babies and the bodies of the deceased on their ancestral land is important in Maori culture (Dansey, 1975; H. Mead, 2003). The *tangihanga*, a burial ceremony lasting upwards of three days, during which the body in an open casket is surrounded by relatives of the deceased, is one of the most enduring and widely practised Maori rituals (Dansey, 1975; H. Mead, 2003). In situations where the deceased person is of mixed tribal ancestry this can lead to conflict between members of different tribes as they negotiate which tribe's ancestral land is the appropriate burial site. This study examines the ongoing connection Maori living in Australia have with New Zealand.

Among traditional Maori personal relationships are highly valued and given precedence over financial and task completion considerations. Maori have a relaxed concept of time, with lateness being acceptable and time schedules not being strictly observed. Thus, Maori culture is polychronic (Hall, 2000b). The phrase "Maori time" is used to describe the Maori attitude to time. When used by a *Pakeha* the phrase may have derogatory connotations, but when used among Maori it has positive connotations (Metge & Kinloch, 1978; R. Walker, 1987).

Although Hofstede (1980; 2001) categorised New Zealand as highly individualistic, based on studies of IBM employees, traditional Maori culture is collectivist (Peszynski & Thanasankit, 2002; Pfeifer & Love, 2004; A. Webster & Perry, 2003). It is also a high-context culture: the communication style is indirect, much of the meaning is evident from the context, rather than from explicit statements, and what is not said may be more important than what is said (Hall, 2000a). It is also past rather than present or future-oriented. Ancestors remain important “anchor points” for modern Maori (H. Mead, 2003). Having said this, it is important to note that most Maori are adept at moving between the Maori and the *Pakeha* worlds, and also operate in individualistic, low-context, and monochronic ways at certain times (R. Walker, 1987).

Discussion of Maori in the context of New Zealand’s cultural and national identity leads to a consideration of the extent to which Maori culture and values are shared by New Zealand society as a whole. As already mentioned, Maori cultural icons such as the *haka* are the most recognisable features of New Zealand in relation to the outside world. In addition, it has been argued that some of the generosity, big-heartedness and community-mindedness typical of Maori moderated the more dour influence of the Anglo-Celtic background of *Pakeha* New Zealanders (King, 2003). For example, respected historian Michael King argued that Maori customs had led to *Pakeha* funerals becoming less formal and adopting elements of Maori *tangihanga* such as having the body at home with the coffin open (Masters, 2004, February 28).

Maori are renowned for their involvement in team sports, notably rugby union and rugby league among the men and netball among the women. Indeed, rugby union has been credited with contributing, more than anything else, to positive relations between Maori and *Pakeha* through its ability to unite members of both cultures (Zavos, in Bergin, 2002; King, 2003). Maori, and Pacific Islanders, enjoy the camaraderie and mateship of the team; this in turn is shared and appreciated by its *Pakeha* members.

For Maori, migration overseas adds to the complexity of associations and affiliations (Durie, 1995). In a study of Maori sport and cultural identity in Australia, Bergin (2002) found that Maori often established good relationships with Australians through

their involvement in sport, and that they adapted Maori cultural activities to their new environment. Given the integration of aspects of Maori culture into mainstream New Zealand culture, an understanding of “traditional” elements of Maori culture, and the acceptance of the “special status” of Maori in New Zealand, the current study explores whether Maori migrants to Australia are more aware of the differences between the identities of the two countries and experience more difficulties adapting to their adopted homeland than *Pakeha* New Zealanders.

### *Changing Nature of New Zealand Identity*

Cultural and national identity is both enduring and changing (Lu & Kao, 2002), and it is evident that New Zealand’s identity has changed over the years. Initially tied to Britain, New Zealand gradually developed its own unique identity as it moved away from its colonial origins, becoming a Dominion in 1907 but not becoming independent until 1947 even though Britain passed legislation which made this possible in 1931 (King, 2003). Since the 1970s, greater acceptance of the place of Maori in New Zealand society has led some people to argue New Zealand had a bicultural identity, while more recently New Zealand has been described as a multicultural Pacific Rim nation (S. Taylor, 1996). Taylor’s investigation of the national identity of New Zealanders living in the United Kingdom found all three elements: forging an identity independent of Britain; biculturalism; and multiculturalism views of New Zealand national identity present in the discourse of the study’s participants. The current study examines the concepts and functions of cultural and national identity held by New Zealand migrants to Australia and New Zealanders who have remained in or returned to New Zealand.

In summary, while New Zealand national identity is a composite of sub-cultures and communities, there is general agreement that a range of characteristics including egalitarianism, connection to the outdoors, rural heritage, strong work ethic, practical ingenuity, a sporting tradition, a tendency to travel, the ANZAC tradition, independence, dislike of domination, and a strong Maori influence can be attributed to New Zealanders as components of their national identity.

It is relevant here to examine Australian identity as well as the nature of the dominant New Zealand identity and Maori identity, to provide a point of comparison for the

current study of how Maori and *Pakeha* New Zealanders adapt and change when they live in Australia.

### Australian Cultural and National Identity

Just as New Zealand identities can encompass a range of characteristics, the same is true of Australian identity. Recently, traditional expressions of Australian identity, such as mateship and larrikinism, have been criticised as being male-dominated and failing to represent today's reality, particularly as they do not represent the views of women, Aborigines, or migrants from non-English-speaking backgrounds (Day, 1998b; Dixon, 1999; Gelber, 2002; Holton, 1998; Turner, 1994). However, studies of how "ordinary" Australians perceive their national identity find that these "traditional" images are still evoked (T. Phillips & Smith, 2000), and analyses show that Prime Minister John Howard's speeches contain numerous references to traditional Australian values such as "mateship" and the "fair go" (Brett, 2003; Darwall, 2005; Day, 1998a; Dyrenfurth, 2005), so these aspects of Australian culture are still considered to have political mileage. Thus, as there is in New Zealand, there is a difference between the way Australian identity is discussed by "experts" and the views of "mainstream" or "ordinary" Australians (Turner, 1994).

As discussed above with reference to New Zealand identity, Dixon (1999) argued that, as shared beliefs and attitudes were necessary for members of different groups to experience a sense of shared cultural and national identity, it was the Anglo-Celtic aspects of Australian life that provided a cohesive sense of identity for the whole culture, and that it was unhelpful to dismiss this as "male chauvinist, racist and historically flawed" (Dixon, 1999, p. 1). Once again, what follows is a discussion of a more traditional Australian identity than academics such as Turner, Day and Gelber have presented, as this more accurately reflects the "popular" view of Australian identity and it is this view which New Zealand migrants to Australia are likely to be exposed to through the media.

Frequently cited defining characteristics of [Anglo-Celtic] Australian identity include egalitarianism, which has been linked to a dislike of formality and a distrust of and cutting down to size of people perceived as being "too big for their boots" (tall poppy syndrome) (Horne, 1966; Wierzbicka, 1995), and a dislike of authority and being told

what to do (perhaps a legacy of their convict roots). Mateship (Bragge, 2003; Page, 2002), and having a rural pioneering heritage exemplified by such characters as the stockman and the digger (soldier, originally gold digger) are also considered part of Australian national identity (Day, 1998a). In addition, Australians see themselves as independent, down to earth, happy-go-lucky, with a tendency to make fun of social norms and conventions, and a larrikin type of personality (T. Phillips & Smith, 2000). When Wierzbicka (1995) made a case for a number of Australian values through an analysis of Anglo-Australian words, she argued Australians valued their freedom, fair play, tolerance, irreverent wit, toughness, and resilience. These values were evident in the psyche of the heroes of a number of Australian films, including *Crocodile Dundee* and *Breaker Morant* (Krausz, 2002). Dundee, in particular, was an example of an optimistic, laid-back, practical character, who was rough around the edges and quietly heroic.

Arguably, the best-known study of Australian identity is Donald Horne's study of Australia, *The Lucky Country* (1966), which attempted to identify and understand the range of values and beliefs that characterised Australians. Horne identified the sentiments reflected in phrases such as "fair go, mate", "having a good time" (e.g. drinking, sport), and "give it a go" as important elements in distinguishing what it was to be Australian. These reflected the value placed on equality, camaraderie, relaxed enjoyment, and practical improvisation.

Forty years later, in an attempt to find out how "ordinary" Australians thought about their nation, Phillips and Smith (2000) used focus groups to get people to generate their own list of "Australian" people, groups, places, activities, events and values. Phillips and Smith found remarkable similarities between rural and urban groups, blue-collar and white-collar workers, the elderly, and women from non-English speaking backgrounds. Participants consistently recognised and endorsed traditional, older, past-oriented symbols and images of Australia, such as those identified by Horne. Australians chosen to represent "Australianess" were down to earth, happy-go-lucky, had a larrikin type of personality, or came from nothing and were still unassuming having got to the top of their field. These views were also reflected in the values and beliefs nominated as Australian by the six groups. These included: mateship, having a relaxed and easy-going orientation to life, disrespect for authority

and pointless rules, giving others a fair go, and giving it a go. While Phillips and Smith's study strongly endorsed the past-oriented values previously identified by Horne, their research was limited in scope. Phillips and Smith only surveyed 49 Australians, all Queenslanders, and the opinions of groups who might have diverged from the more traditional image of what it is to be Australian, such as Aborigines and youth, were not included.

A study of school-age Australians which asked participants to give a rating of the extent to which they agreed with statements regarding national identity found that the most important aspects of being Australian related to democracy and diversity. Males strongly endorsed sporting prowess and an outdoor lifestyle, whereas females were more likely to endorse diversity (Purdie, 2003).

Much has been made of the masculine Australian concept of mateship as a defining aspect of what it meant to be Australian (Bragge, 2003; McLean, 2003; Page, 2002). Mateship involves loyalty, solidarity and a commitment to helping others, especially in times of need. This can be linked to Australia's rural pioneering heritage and is exemplified in the ANZAC tradition (Day, 1998a).

Increasingly, after the landmark Mabo High Court ruling in 1992 that indigenous peoples might have retained legal ownership rights to land in some circumstances, overturning the previous assumption, made in 1788, that Australia was "terra nullius", or empty land, Australians are coming to terms with a history and culture older than the first settlers as a part of their cultural identity. This was exemplified in the opening ceremony for the 2000 Olympic Games, where it was uncontested that aspects of both Aborigine and settler history epitomised Australian culture. The influence of migrant groups is increasingly being felt, and it is acknowledged that traditional images exclude women as well. Despite attempts by academics to reconstruct Australian national identity to reflect more accurately the make-up of present-day Australia, specifically to include women, Aborigines, and migrant groups (see for example, Turner, 1994), Phillips and Smith's (2000) "ordinary" Australians identified with the more traditional images referred to in John Howard's speeches (Brett, 2003; Darwall, 2005; Dyrenfurth, 2005). This is an example of agenda-setting (McCombs, 2004; McCombs & Shaw, 1972); the public believes that the values espoused by Howard



accurately reflect Australian identity because they are publicly stated and repeated in the media.

To summarise, despite the changing nature of Australian society and arguments that it is inappropriate to speak of a single Australian identity, traditional images such as mateship and everyone getting a fair go are still part of the Australian national consciousness (Gelber, 2002).

### Similarities and Differences Between Australian and New Zealand Cultural And National Identities

#### *Similarities*

Similarities between Australia and New Zealand include a common language, similar Anglo-Celtic origins, similar religious affiliations (although denominational strengths vary between countries)<sup>10</sup>, the adaptation of British institutions over time, similar education systems, rural beginnings, similar customs and values, and a common bond forged by serving alongside each other in successive world wars. Both countries were settled at about the same time, are geographically isolated in the same part of the world, and have small populations by world standards. Both countries shared a British colonial heritage, and were aware of their isolation from European countries with long and rich cultural histories. Similarly, both countries were inhabited by indigenous people at the time of European settlement, and both national cultures have been influenced by intercultural contact between the two peoples, although indigenous cultures have had differing influences on mainstream culture, as discussed below. Both countries experienced the effects of continuing migration from diverse cultures and subsequent increases in multiculturalism.

Many of the qualities of Australian identity also hold true for New Zealand. Like Australians, New Zealanders value egalitarianism as an ideal and much of what it means to be both a New Zealander and an Australian is rooted in their rural heritage, even though both countries are highly urbanised. This pioneer, rural heritage was

---

<sup>10</sup> Roman Catholicism is the biggest religious grouping in Australia with 27% (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2003), while in New Zealand the biggest group is Anglican with 27%, compared with 14% Catholic (Statistics New Zealand, 2002). Buddhism (1.9%) and Islam (1.5%) are present in greater proportions in Australia than New Zealand (1.2% and 0.7% respectively).

initially expressed as “man against the environment” and can be used to explain both cultures being male-dominated and valuing physical activity, especially sport, over intellectual endeavours (J. Phillips, 1996a; Purdie, 2003). Like the Australians, New Zealanders are at least partially defined by the national recollection of the Gallipoli experience and are proud of the ANZAC tradition. They also dislike formality and are distrustful of people who they perceive to be “too big for their boots”. This criticism of people who rise above the rest is known as the “tall poppy syndrome” in New Zealand, just as it is in Australia (Mouly & Sankaran, 2002). Freedom, democracy, an outdoor lifestyle, warm-heartedness, and relaxed informality are also shared in common (Gelber, 2002). In addition, both countries considered the British abandoned them after the fall of Singapore during the second world war, needed to deal with weakening trade and cultural connections with Britain in the 1960s, and share a sense of isolation and the vulnerability of having small populations and economies (Gelber, 2002).

#### *Similarities Indicated by Cultural Values Theories*

To examine similarities between New Zealand and Australia more closely, theories relating to differences in the values between cultures are now considered. Hofstede’s (1980, 2001) research on international differences in work-related values suggested New Zealand and Australia were very similar. Both cultures were found to be very high on the individualism dimension, the extent to which the interests of the individual or the collective are promoted. Australia ranked second with a score of 90 (compared with the 91 earned by the United States) and New Zealand sixth, with a score of 79 when the average score of all countries surveyed was 43 (Hofstede, 1980 cited in Hofstede, 2001). However, Hofstede’s sample of IBM employees was largely drawn from the upper echelons of society and was unlikely to have included many Maori. In addition, to describe Australia and New Zealand as highly individualistic fails to explain the extent to which Australians and New Zealanders see themselves as willing to help each other, especially in times of need.

As previously discussed, Australia is renowned as the country of “mateship”, and this is demonstrated in times of difficulty. During 2002, Australians gave \$14.5 million to an appeal fund for the victims of the Bali bombing as well as \$20 million to the “Farmhand Appeal” for the thousands of farmers who faced hardship after years of

drought (Power, 2003). Similar public support was evident for the victims of the January 2003 Canberra bush fires and the 2004 Asian tsunami when over \$111 million was donated (World Vision Australia, 2006) demonstrating the willingness of Australians to support those in need outside as well as inside their country. New Zealanders display a similar willingness to give others a helping hand. For example, New Zealanders gave more to Telethon appeals and other community efforts per head of capita than any other country (Perry, 1989). Triandis (1995:2002) provided an explanation for this apparent anomaly.

Triandis' refinement of Hofstede's theory to differentiate between vertical and horizontal individualism and vertical and horizontal collectivism can be applied to Australia and New Zealand's cultural values. Both cultures can best be described as horizontal individualist, with hierarchical differentiation de-emphasised and attempts made by governments to lessen distinctions between in-groups and out-groups (Triandis et al., 1988; Triandis & Suh, 2002).

To sum up, rather than seeing Australians and New Zealanders as individualistic, it is possible to describe both societies as horizontally individualistic, and their big-hearted response to others in times of need provides just one example of behaviour typical of horizontal individualism.

With few exceptions, the core values of Australians and New Zealanders are very similar. Both countries value egalitarianism, an honest no-nonsense approach to life and a sense of fair play. Both countries favour relaxed informality, value masculine pursuits, loyalty to one's mates and respect practical, down-to-earth, modest achievers. These similarities are evident in Hofstede's research on cultural values (Hofstede, 1980, 2001) which, in addition to high scores on the individualism dimension, as outlined in chapter 3 suggested Australia and New Zealand were very similar with regards to power distance, the extent to which the less powerful members of a society accept that power is distributed unevenly, and masculinity, the extent to which power and assertiveness is valued in the culture. Both countries had low power distance, reinforcing the view that they were egalitarian societies, and both were relatively high in masculine values, Australia was ranked 16<sup>th</sup> out of 53 countries, and New Zealand 17<sup>th</sup>.

To sum up, there are many similarities between Australian and New Zealand cultural identities, however, both New Zealanders and Australians perceive differences, as discussed below.

### *Differences Between Australian and New Zealand Cultural Identities*

Despite their similarities to Australians, New Zealanders emphasise the differences between the cultural and national identities of the two countries (Catley, 2001c), such as perceived superiority over relations with their indigenous people, the perceived stain of Australia's convict origins, and a less sycophantic relationship with the United States. Other distinctions include differing emphases on biculturalism and multiculturalism, the effect of geographical and climatic differences, and differences in the style of humour between the two countries.

Arguably, the greatest difference between Australia and New Zealand is the influence of Maori upon *Pakeha* New Zealanders, while Australia has demonstrated less Aboriginal influence in their identity. This difference can be explained in part by Maori making up a significant proportion of New Zealand's population, 15% in 2005 (Statistics New Zealand, 2006a) and, despite being tribal, having had a collective presence since colonisation, whereas the Aborigines now make up only 2% of Australia's population (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2001), and were historically more dispersed and less united, which is partly a factor differences in the size of the two countries, New Zealand's land area being 270,500 square kilometres (Statistics New Zealand, 2006c) compared to Australia's 7,690,000 (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2005). Of the two indigenous cultures, the Maori were the more adaptable, articulate and homogenous. Maori from different tribes spoke different dialects but could understand each other, whereas the Aborigines spoke more than 250 different languages (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, n.d.). While Maori were considered important to the early development of New Zealand to the extent a treaty was entered into with them, Aborigines, in contrast, were not taken into account in the decision-making of early Australian governors to the same extent. While it is apparent that aspects of Maori culture have been incorporated into New Zealand's majority culture, it is less obvious how Australians in day-to-day life have incorporated Aboriginal culture into their cultural identity.

Australia and New Zealand have both attracted more culturally diverse populations in the last 25 years. In Australia there was a policy of multiculturalism, valuing all cultures. New Zealand, in contrast has, since the 1980s, given the Maori special status and pursued a policy of biculturalism (Patman, 2001; Williams, 1996). New Zealand sees itself as part of the Pacific, meaning Polynesia, while Australians have been encouraged to consider themselves part of Asia (Hubbard, 2003, August 3; McLean, 2003).

It is argued that climate influences cultural identity (Triandis & Suh, 2002), and that the differences between the humour of Australia and New Zealand are partially the result of adaptation to climatic differences. There are obvious differences between New Zealand, several temperate, wet, green islands surrounded by sea (no point is more than 128 kilometres from the coast) (Eriksen, 2006, February 6), and Australia, a big, brown land (McLean, 2003). Willey (1988) suggested that Australia's harsh climate had considerably influenced its distinctive humour. Australian pioneers learned that they had to co-exist with their environment rather than attempt to tame it. Willey suggested that "as a result the national mood became one of stoic acceptance, reflected in a type of humour as dry as the desert claypan" (Willey, 1988, p. 156). Both Willey and Greer (2003) believed that the Aborigines had a greater influence on white Australians than was generally recognised, and Willey considered this particularly evident with regards to humour. Willey considered the use of irony, self-criticism, the deliberate "cutting down of tall poppies", and lack of sentimentality to be features of humour which Aborigines and white Australians shared. Greer referred to the telling of stories, or yarns, as common to both groups. While most Australians now live in cities, a laconic sense of humour remains a feature of their distinctive identity.

New Zealand, on the other hand, is a temperate island country, without the harshness of Australia's climate (Matthewman, 2001). Its climate is more similar to the United Kingdom's climate than to Australia's, and its sense of humour remains more British in character. While some would argue that, in addition, New Zealand's humour has been influenced by the Maori style of teasing and banter (Olssen, 1991), the New Zealand sense of humour typically lacks the deadpan elements of Australian humour.

New Zealand and Australia have very different recent relationships with the United States. Prime Minister John Howard has been direct about the importance of Australia's relationship with the United States, referring to it as "the most important we have with any single country", (Darwall, 2005, p. 5) with Australia presenting itself as 'Washington's staunchest ally' (Patman, 2001, p. 399). In contrast, New Zealand is proud of its anti-nuclear stance (Cheng, 2005, June 14; New Zealand Herald, 2005, August 11) which effectively banned all United States ships from New Zealand in 1985 and led to its exclusion from ANZUS, the security treaty between Australia, New Zealand and the United States, and the redefining of defence agreements.

To sum up, while broadly similar, the identities of the two countries differ with regards to integration of their indigenous peoples, the effect of differing climates and geography, and divergence in foreign policy. The current study examines the extent to which New Zealand migrants and stayers consider Australia and New Zealand differ.

#### Australia–New Zealand Relations

This section explores more formal ways in which New Zealand is linked with Australia, such as the extent to which their economies are connected. New Zealand and Australia have had close connection since European settlement and have been variously referred to as siblings, cousins, allies, and partners (Catley, 2002; Willmott, 1989). As previously discussed, the Gallipoli experience during World War One created a strong bond and sense of mutual respect between the two countries. However, the ANZAC tradition is not as strong as it once was, as leaders whose views were forged during the first and second world wars have handed over power to a new generation for whom the ANZAC tradition was not as important (Harvey, 2003).

Because of Australia's larger economy, greater natural resources, and greater population, Trans-Tasman relations are of greater significance to New Zealanders than they are to Australians. For example, in defence terms Australia is vital to New Zealand, but the reverse is not true (Kerr, 2002). Australia is New Zealand's largest trading partner, accounting for over 20% of both imports and exports, while New

Zealand is only the third largest market for Australian exports (Hazledine, 2002; Patman, 2001). In addition, a much larger proportion of New Zealanders migrate to Australia than Australians move to New Zealand. In June 2005 an estimated 449,000 New Zealanders were living in Australia (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006a), while only 56,259 Australians were living in New Zealand in 2001 (Statistics New Zealand, 2001).

There has been contact between Australia and New Zealand since the earliest British settlement of New South Wales, and there are significant linkages between the two countries. These include: migration between the two countries, discussed in chapter 5; considerable economic interdependence, assisted by the Closer Economic Relations (CER) agreement in place between the two countries since 1983; and defence and security agreements.

Such was the close relationship between Australia and New Zealand in 1901 that New Zealand was given the option to join Australia at Federation. However, New Zealand declined, citing physical separation as the major reason (Patman, 2001). While a clause in the Australian constitution still provides for New Zealand to join Australia, this seems unlikely in the foreseeable future, even though New Zealand would benefit in economic terms from a union with Australia (Catley, 2001c; McLean, 2003). New Zealanders discuss the pros and cons of uniting with Australia from time to time, but equate this with effectively being taken over by Australia. Nationalism and a feeling of distinctiveness prevents serious discussion of a merger (McLean, 2003).

The relationship between Australia and New Zealand has been likened to sibling rivalry. New Zealanders counter what they see as attempts to turn New Zealand into a mere satellite of Australia by emphasising any failure or disappointment experienced by Australia. In addition, New Zealanders describe differences between the two countries more often than Australians do (McLean, 2003). This rivalry is most evident in the sporting arena, with New Zealanders celebrating victories over their larger neighbour and becoming despondent after defeats. The rivalry is also evident in ritualistic banter between Australians and New Zealanders, who use each other as the butt of their jokes.

While New Zealand and Australia have experienced economic convergence in recent years, they have diverged over foreign policy, defence and security. Ever since David Lange's government banned all nuclear powered or armed ships from New Zealand in 1984, effectively excluding the country from the tripartite security treaty with Australia and the United States (ANZUS), Australia and New Zealand's defence policies have diverged. More recently, Helen Clark's government dismantled the combat arm of the air force placing a greater burden on Australia's defence capabilities, particularly in the sea and the air, in the region (Moldofsky, 2001; Patman, 2001). New Zealanders are proud of their anti-nuclear stance and claim the moral high ground over what they perceive as bullying tactics on the part of the United States (Cheng, 2005, June 14; New Zealand Herald, 2005, August 11).

New Zealand has an ambivalent relationship with Australia. New Zealanders are fiercely independent and constantly assert their differences, whilst Australia remains important in economic and in defence terms. This relationship was wryly summed up by Mike Moore, a former New Zealand Prime Minister and Director-General of the World Trade Organisation: "Always remember, the Australians are our best friends, even if we don't like them" (McLean, 2003, p. 307).

#### Conclusion and Research Questions Arising from New Zealand's Cultural and National Identity Literature

Having explored prevailing images of New Zealand and Australian culture, and the many similarities between the two cultures, as well as acknowledging the distinctions between them and the importance New Zealanders place on maintaining these differences, we return to the question of what the function of these concepts of New Zealand national identity are, whose creation they are, and whose interests they serve (R. White, 1981).

The majority of the images New Zealanders construct of their cultural and national identity are positive, as found by Taylor (1996) in a study of New Zealanders living in Britain. This can be explained by social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), which suggests there is an emotional link between group membership and self-identity, and individuals' tendency to be positively biased towards groups to which they belong.



New Zealand is an isolated nation with a tiny population by world standards; consequently, as is predicted by optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991, 1999), New Zealanders have a strong need for a positive national identity to boost their individual and collective self-image and convince themselves that they are worthwhile. As indicated in chapter 3, this study examines the boundary maintenance behaviour of New Zealanders living in Australia and compares it with that of New Zealanders living in their country of origin.

The discussion in this chapter has considered many areas in the relationship between New Zealand and Australia, and New Zealand migrants and Australians. Questions that arose and which this study further explores through analysis of the interviews in the light of the literature are listed below.

1. What do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia communicate about the identity of New Zealanders when they live in Australia? (Project one)
2. What do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia and interviews with New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand reveal about their concept of New Zealand identity? (Projects one and three)
3. To what extent do the views of the two groups differ? (Projects one and three)
4. What is the function of “myths” of New Zealand identity, whose creation are they, and whose interests do they serve? (Projects one and three)
5. What aspects of New Zealand cultural identity do New Zealanders become more aware of when they migrate to Australia? (Project one)
6. To what extent do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia and interview data from New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand present New Zealand and Australian identity as similar? (Projects one and three)
7. Are Maori migrants to Australia more aware of the differences between the identities of the two countries and do they experience more difficulty adapting to Australia than do *Pakeha* New Zealanders? (Project one)

## **Chapter 5: Literature Review Three: Migration and Transnationalism**

“The decision to relocate one’s ... family ... to a new setting and society is one of the most drastic social actions people may take during their lifetime, making motives for migration a worthy topic for study” (Gold, 1997 para. 3).

Migration is a fluid concept that means different things to different people. The purpose of this chapter is to examine how the concept of migration has been defined and elaborated in examinations of movements of people from one country to another. For some project one interviewees the decision to relocate to Australia was planned and anticipated over a lengthy period of time, while for others migration was not planned but became a reality after they arrived in Australia. Thus, it is difficult to define migration in the modern world, where people may live in another country for a period of time, but not intend to stay permanently, either moving back to their homeland or on to another country. Both physical and communicative contacts are more easily made and maintained in the modern world, so that the decision to live in another country does not necessarily mean separation from one’s own country. These changes in the nature and meaning of migration mean it is an important time to examine the experiences of modern day migrants.

This chapter explores concepts of migration and transnationalism which apply to the issues, concerns and themes raised by interviewees in project one of the current study. Previous research into motivations for migration, and how the identity of a migrant is reconstructed by the changes in his or her life raise research questions for further exploration in projects two and three and provide a context for analysis of the results of the current study which examines what New Zealanders communicate about their reasons for migrating to Australia and their subsequent experiences in Australia.

As little research has been conducted into why New Zealanders migrate to Australia, studies of broadly similar migrations from one first world country to another, such as Canadian migration to the United States, and Scottish, Irish and Welsh migration to England provide comparisons with trans-Tasman migrants. In addition, studies into the personality of “migrators”, the concept of transnationalism, and a discussion of what is currently known about trans-Tasman migration also provide a context for

analysis. An assessment of the relative importance of push and pull factors in the decision to migrate and the concept of transnationalism are useful in providing a means for analysing the reasons New Zealanders migrate to Australia and their subsequent experiences.

New Zealanders are highly mobile. While difficult to measure precisely it is estimated that the equivalent of about 17% (Bedford et al., 2003; Bushnell & Choy, 2001) of New Zealand's four million population live overseas, with the most popular destination being Australia, which accounts for about two-thirds of all New Zealand migrants (Bushnell & Choy, 2001). In June 2005 an estimated 449,000 New Zealanders were living in Australia (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006a), making New Zealanders the second-largest overseas-born group in Australia, after the British and about 2% of the Australian population (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2004; Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006c; Khoo, 2002). However, despite the implications for both societies, little academic research has been conducted on the interplay of factors motivating New Zealanders to move across the Tasman or the impact migration has on their lives

### Factors Motivating People to Migrate

Migration, defined as the movement of people "from one country to another with the intention of taking up residence there" (Faist, 2000, p. 18), is the result of a complex interplay of factors which no single theory coherently explains (Massey et al., 2006; Segal et al., 2006; Stimson & Minnery, 1998). Theorising has primarily focused either on macro-level structural issues such as differences between economies, or political regimes, or the micro individual decision-making level, explaining factors motivating individuals to move from one country to another (Faist, 2000).

### *Economic Push–Pull Factors*

Economic, especially employment factors, are important considerations in the migration decision and have been the most common focus of theorising (Faist, 2000; Massey et al., 2006). For example the macro-theory, world systems theory (Wallerstein, in Massey et al., 2006), focuses on the movement of labour from areas with comparatively poor economies to more developed areas with more job

opportunities and the prospects of higher pay. At the micro-level, earning capacity is a key factor in the commonly cited “push-pull” model which analyses motivation to migrate according to factors which push potential immigrants to leave their home and those that pull them towards their destination (Kline, 2003; Kontuly et al., 1995; Lee, 1966; Madden & Young, 1993; Moran, Nancarrow, & Butler, 2005; Stimson & Minnery, 1998). The push-pull model suggests migration may occur if, after consideration of positive and negative factors at origin and destination, the balance is strongly in favour of the destination, provided intervening obstacles, such as immigration laws are surmountable and personal factors, such as openness to change are present (Lee, 1966).

Those responding primarily to pull factors are not forced migrants, but freely choose to move. They tend to be in comfortable circumstances in their country of origin, and to make an immediate positive contribution, in terms of human capital of skills and educational resources, in their adopted homeland. This contrasts with less advantaged migrants responding primarily to push factors, whose immediate contribution may be less positive (Lee, 1966). The most obvious group of pushed migrants are refugees or those dislocated by war. However, in a sense migrants who are dissatisfied at home are “pushed” by this very dissatisfaction to seek somewhere that is potentially more satisfying. It is worth exploring whether migrants who were dissatisfied with aspects of life in New Zealand will also be dissatisfied with life in Australia, that is, whether some migrants will be dissatisfied wherever they lived. Accordingly, project two of the current study examines whether New Zealanders who were dissatisfied with aspects of New Zealand were less satisfied with life in Australia than those responding to pull factors.

In contrast to Lee’s (1966) assertions, Zodgekar in a study of British migrants to New Zealand argued that people who are satisfied in their country of origin do not migrate; it is the dissatisfied who are migrants. He found that there was a “migration threshold” which was acted on only when dissatisfaction had built up to a crucial level. Emigration was motivated by the migrant feeling insecure and inadequate in their original setting (Zodgekar, 1990). Accordingly, the current study compares the satisfaction level of migrants and stayers in projects two and three to determine if

migrants in the current study were indeed less satisfied with life in New Zealand than participants who did not choose to migrate.

### *Wider Push-Pull Factors*

While economic, especially employment, factors are important in the migration decision, lifestyle factors are also significant. Increasingly, the importance of cultural, environmental, family life cycle, quality of life, and social reasons for moving is recognised (Kontuly et al., 1995; Stimson & Minnery, 1998; Von Reichert, 2001). Project two of the current study compares the relative importance of lifestyle and economic factors in New Zealanders' decision to move to Australia.

### *Usefulness of Push-Pull Migration Model*

The classic push-pull migration cause and effect migration model (Ryan, 2004) overemphasises rational cost-benefit calculations (Boyd, 1989; Portes, 1989), and fails to explain why people move from some economically disadvantaged countries and not from others, why some people leave a country while others experiencing the same circumstances stay, and why some migrants subsequently return to their homeland (Faist, 2000). As Lee (1966), the originator of the push-pull theory himself noted, the decision to migrate is not entirely rational as it is partially based on emotions and the potential migrant's imaginings about life in another country which cannot be entirely known prior to migration. Lee considered the personality of potential migrants was also a factor in the migration decision.

Other approaches to migration emphasise structural factors such as the host country's attitude to immigration, and previous colonial relationships between countries, and social networks between people in host and receiving countries (Faist, 2000; Massey et al., 2006). However, economic disparities between sending and receiving societies are common to most migration models and studies frequently consider push and pull factors in explaining migrants' reasons for relocating (Madden & Young, 1993; Moran et al., 2005; Segal et al., 2006; Stimson & Minnery, 1998). As New Zealand migrants to Australia interviewed for project one cited factors in both New Zealand and Australia among their reasons for moving to Australia, the push-pull model provides an effective broad categorisation of their reasons for migration. The push-pull migration model provides a useful framework with which to examine other

analyses of motivations to migrate, such as the typologies developed by Tartakovsky and Schwartz (2001) and Taylor (1969). Accordingly, the current study in project two examines push and pull factors in New Zealanders' decision to move to Australia. This is augmented by an assessment of personality characteristics and the extent to which principles of transnationalism apply to trans-Tasman migrants.

### *Typologies of Motivations to Migrate*

Tartakovsky and Schwartz (2001) identified three migration motivations: preservation (physical, social, and psychological security); self-development (personal growth in abilities, knowledge, and skills); and materialism (desire to improve economic and job situation). Preservation could be labelled a push factor, while self-development and materialism can be seen as pull factors. Tartakovsky and Schwartz argued that if people were unable to fulfil their goals and express their values in their own native land some would adapt by emigrating. Tartakovsky and Schwartz found ambivalence was greatest among those who migrate for preservation reasons. These migrants were traditionalists and security seekers whose risk taking (migration) was motivated by the desire to obtain long-term security.

In his typology Taylor (1969) divided migrants into “dislocated”, “aspirers”, and “resultant”. Dislocated, or secondary migrants, were motivated to migrate to be reunited with family members who had already emigrated, aspirers migrated because of overall dissatisfaction with how they had been doing, and resultant migrants were pressured by their situation to move and took advantage of opportunities to migrate without much prior consideration. “Dislocated” and “aspirers” can be described as motivated by pull factors and “resultant” by push factors. The current study in project one investigates whether New Zealand migrants to Australia see themselves as either pushed by circumstances beyond their control (“resultant”, “dislocated”) or created by their own identity (“aspirers”).

### *Effect of Personality Characteristics on Decision to Migrate*

People who are ambitious, innovative and diligent are considered likely to migrate from countries undervaluing their skills to countries valuing them more highly (Freeman, 1999). After considering Taylor's categorisation into dislocated, resultant, and aspirers Boneva and Frieze (2001) proposed a set of personality characteristics

that differentiated migrants from those who wanted to stay in their country of origin, arguing secondary migrants (those who migrated to be reunited with family members, i.e. pull factors) would have higher affiliation motivation and family centrality than primary migrants (those making the initial decision to leave their country of origin). Boneva and Frieze (2001) argued primary migrants were more work-oriented, had higher achievement and power motivations and lower affiliation motivation and family centrality than those who chose to stay at home. The current study compares the self-perceptions of New Zealand migrants to Australia in project one with stayers in project three on the dimensions of work-orientation, achievement and power affiliations and family centrality.

While Maori differ in the extent to which they identify with traditional values (Fitzgerald et al., 2000), they are usually categorised as “collectivist” on Hofstede’s (1980; 2001) “individualist”/“collectivist” continuum (Peszynski & Thanasankit, 2002; Pfeifer & Love, 2004) with close kinship ties (Patterson, 1992), while Hofstede (1980; 2001) categorised New Zealanders, in general, as highly individualistic. Thus Maori (collectivist) migrants to Australia might be expected to have higher affiliation motivation and family centrality than *Pakeha* (individualist) and this is examined in the current study.

### *Effect of Age, Life Stage, and Gender*

Age, life stage, and gender of migrants can influence migration decisions (M. Bell & Ward, 2000; Gray, 1996; Phinney, G, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001; Ryan, 2004; Segal et al., 2006; Von Reichert, 2001). Migration may occur across the lifespan in response to events in the life cycle such as marriage, divorce, changes in employment and retirement (M. Bell & Ward, 2000; Lee, 1966). Within a country, young people tend to leave small communities for college, jobs and the “bright lights” in larger urban areas while they might see migration to another country as an adventure and source of excitement, as is the case with young Scottish people contemplating moving to England (McCrone, 2005). In contrast, older people might value smaller communities for their strong interpersonal relationships and neighbourliness (Von Reichert, 2001). Age at the time of migration affects subsequent adaptation and identity (Phinney et al., 2001) with young people adapting more quickly than older people (Liebkind, 1996).

Migration scholars have also noted the mediating effect of gender on the migration experience (see for example Madden & Young, 1993). Studies have indicated women lacked autonomy and were less involved in the decision-making process (Ryan, 2004), that migration had varying effects on women's personal power (Parrado, Flippen, & McQuiston, 2005), and that women and men had differing perspective regarding their national identity (Gray, 1996). The current study in project two examines whether New Zealanders' reasons for moving to Australia differ depending on the age, gender, and life stage of the migrants.

#### Studies of Migration from one First World Country to Another

New Zealand migration to Australia can be compared with migration to and from other first world countries. Such migrations typically involve moving to a more affluent and larger first world country, as is the case with migration from Canada to the United States, and from Scotland, Ireland, and Wales to England. Migration from New Zealand to the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom to Australia, and Israel to the United States also provide useful comparisons.

Reasons presented for migrating from one first world country to another cluster round either economic or personal development explanations. Economic factors such as earnings differentials and unemployment levels between countries are a major catalyst for migration. Studies of Canadian migration to the United States suggest greater earnings capacity and lower taxes in the United States has contributed to a "brain drain" of Canada's "best and brightest" (Buttrick, 1992; Iqbal, 2000; Mueller, 1999; Statistics Canada, 2000). Similarly, studies of Scottish, Irish, and Welsh migration to England suggested this was motivated by scarcity of suitable jobs and higher rates of unemployment in their homeland (Gray, 1996; Migration Watch UK, 2004). However, some studies contradict this view. One study of Welsh and Scottish-born migrants in London, for example, suggested a brain drain effect for the Welsh as highly educated Welsh-born were over-represented in London, but the same was not true for the Scottish-born. This difference between the Welsh and Scottish groups was attributed to comparatively greater opportunities for fulfillment of career ambition in Scotland (P. White, 2003). Similarly, while Irish migrants to England have also been represented as highly educated individuals seeking career advancement, this has been challenged by other researchers as emigration from Ireland to England is also present



among the working class. In addition, studies of Irish women migrants in the 1980s, for example, suggested many were seeking to escape from repressive legislation relating to abortion and divorce (Gray, 1996).

Concerns are frequently expressed, particularly by opposition politicians, that New Zealand loses its best and brightest to Australia (Allen, 2005; *Courier-Mail*, 2006, May 13; Watkins, 2006, May 15; Weir, 2006, May 11). Such commentators fail to take into account that, while there is a “drain”, New Zealanders in Australia are representative of the entire New Zealand population and the highly educated and skilled are not over-represented (Bushnell & Choy, 2001). In fact, there has been an increase in both lower-skilled migrants from New Zealand and those with higher skills who are older or not in approved occupational groupings (Bushnell & Choy, 2001). Earnings differentials between New Zealand and Australia do appear to be a significant factor in trans-Tasman migration, with “real incomes” estimated to average 32% higher in Australia in 2006 (*New Zealand Herald*, 2006, May 13). Migration from New Zealand to Australia poses the problem of loss of human resources in general; New Zealanders were moving at a rate of 600 a week in 2005-6 (Collins, 2006, March 21; Statistics New Zealand, 2006b). However, some economists argue the movement of large numbers of New Zealanders to Australia has a positive effect on the New Zealand economy as New Zealanders tend to move to Australia in times of economic recession, thus reducing the number of jobless in New Zealand (Bushnell & Choy, 2001; Carmichael, 1993), and presumably they could easily return if the New Zealand economy provided greater opportunities.

A second reason for migration from one first world country to another is the desire for greater personal satisfaction and development. This contrasts with migration from areas of economic or political hardship, where economic considerations are of paramount importance. For example, Conradson and Latham (2005) in their study of young New Zealanders in the United Kingdom noted that economic considerations were secondary to the desire for expanded horizons and self-development. Similarly, Madden and Young (1993) and Eccleston (2006, February 4) found that Australian immigrants from the United Kingdom and Ireland cited lifestyle benefits more frequently than economic ones. Seventy-one percent of those surveyed cited “quality of life” as a benefit of moving to Australia, 67% “better climate/environment”, and

42% “a change, adventure”, compared with 42% who cited better work, job or business prospects (Madden & Young, 1993, p. 105). The current study in project two examines whether perceived personal satisfaction and lifestyle benefits, such as the desire for a change, sense of adventure and opportunities afforded by a warmer climate, were factors in New Zealanders’ decision to move to Australia.

Parallels with the narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia are evident in studies of Israeli migrants to the United States and Irish migration to England. In studies of Israelis in the United States Gold and Phillips (in Gold, 1997) found that while many migrants cited economic opportunities, unification with relatives already living in the United States, and a desire for “broader horizons”, disillusionment and frustration with the social constraints of living in a small isolated country were also factors. Gold also noted that many described their presence in the United States as temporary or somewhat unintentional resulting from an extended visit, as was the case with some New Zealand interviewees. Commentators on Irish migration to England have asserted that despite the Irish being the largest ethnic minority in England, making up nearly two percent of the total population (Greenslade, 1992), Irish migration was often ignored or misunderstood as internal migration (Gray, 1996). Again this parallels the experience of New Zealanders in Australia who make up a similar proportion of the Australian population.

### Cultural Adaptation

Much migration research has focused on the way migrants adapt to their new environment and the extent to which assimilation and integration occurs (Altrocchi & Altrocchi, 1995; Berry, 2001; Portes, 1997; Rudmin & Ahmadzadeh, 2002). While previously it was considered preferable for migrants to assimilate into the new society by adopting the attitudes, values, and behaviours of the host nation (Alba & Nee, 1997), more recently attitudes of receiving countries have changed to acknowledge that migrants might prefer to retain aspects of their own cultures and that host societies might benefit from such diversity (Segal et al., 2006). Berry (2001), for example, has argued that immigrant adaptation to the new culture could more usefully be examined through the notion of acculturation, the process by which a person’s culture is modified or changed through contact with another culture. Acculturation is a two way process; at the same time as the values, ways of behaving and beliefs of the

immigrants change to become more like those of the host culture, the host culture also changes as a result of this contact. While, the culture of the immigrant appears more likely to change, recent acculturation research has focused more closely on mutual change (Berry, 2001).

Changes in immigrants and host society members' attitudes and behaviours depend on the extent to which members of both groups seek contact with individuals outside their group and the extent to which they wished to maintain their original culture. Integration (involvement in the society of their adopted country at the same time retaining aspects of the culture of their country of origin) and multiculturalism (the host society's acceptance, even celebration of cultural diversity) lead to higher levels of migrant psychological wellbeing (Berry, 2001; Phinney et al., 2001). Individuals who retain a strong ethnic identity while also identifying with the new society are considered to have an integrated or bicultural identity (Phinney et al., 2001), similar to the identity described as transnational below. Attitudes towards immigration in the host country affect their receptivity to immigrants and their subsequent adaptation. Australia with its history of acceptance of immigration as integral to its development (Holton, 1998) has policies which are more accepting of immigrants than, for example, Germany which until recently formally accepted as migrants only people who could trace their heritage to German ancestors, and did not grant citizenship to the children of "guest workers" even when they were born in Germany (Dovidio & Esses, 2001).

Critics argue acculturation is an outdated research approach as contemporary migrants move backwards and forwards between their country of origin and their adopted country, maintaining multiple connections with both countries (Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995; Glick-Schiller et al., 1992; Vertovec, 2001). Transnationalists assert it is more productive to study migrants' networks and ties, than their level of acculturation. Some transnationalists, however, consider that the acculturation and transnationalist approaches to migration are not mutually exclusive and that transnationalism is, in fact, one possible variant of acculturation (Kivisto, 2001).

Berry's (2001) acculturation approach has also been criticised for lack of rigour in its categorisation and measurement. It has been argued (Rudmin & Ahmadzadeh, 2002) that integration is an impossible ideal as many aspects of differences between cultures

cannot be reconciled. For example it is not possible to integrate religious identity, as an immigrant cannot be, for example, both Christian (dominant host country religion) and Muslim (migrant's religion in country of origin).

While a study of migrant adaptation and acculturation might be important for groups who have moved to countries whose cultures differ markedly from their country of origin, project one interviewees reported few difficulties adapting to life in Australia. Accordingly, while this study notes how New Zealand migrants adapt to life in Australia it focuses closely on the extent to which they maintain transnationalist connections, as discussed in more detail below.

Similarly, with closely linked societies it might be expected that “culture shock”, the stress reaction associated with entering a new culture (Oberg, 1960), would not occur. However studies have indicated that assumptions about the similarity of cultures may prevent migrants from adapting to subtle cultural differences. A study of Canadian retail companies which had expanded into the United States, for example, found that only 22% functioned effectively, and the difficulties were attributed to executives failing to take account of differences between the two cultures (O'Grady & Larne, 1996). Accordingly, the experiences of New Zealand migrants to Australia interviewed for project one were examined for the presence of culture shock.

Culture shock occurs in four stages. Stage one; the “honeymoon” is characterised by initial fascination with and positive views of the new culture based on early and superficial interactions. Stage two; the “crisis” occurs when differences between the culture in one's country of origin and the new one create problems resulting in feelings of frustration, inadequacy, and sometimes depression. Stage three; the “recovery” is characterised by the gradual development of the skills necessary to function in the new culture, and stage four; the “adjustment” occurs when the migrant has acquired enough skills and communication proficiency to enjoy life in the new culture (Oberg, 1960).

Reverse culture shock can occur when an individual returns “home”, having changed as a result of living overseas (Jandt, 2003). Similarly, Polyzoi (1985) found that Greek migrants to Canada experienced a feeling of “strangeness” when they made return

visits to Greece. The migrants realised they had changed, friends and family left behind had changed, and Greece had changed over the intervening years. Accordingly, the concept of home they had treasured now existed only in their memories. These return visits made the migrants realise they had become integrated into Canadian society. Accounts of participants in the current study are examined for examples of reverse culture shock and “strangeness” on return visits to New Zealand.

### Cost Benefit Analysis

It was evident from the project one interviews that some participants engaged in comparisons between New Zealand and Australia. Other researchers have also commented on this tendency for migrants to engage in comparisons. Sjaastad, in a microeconomic model of migration, proposed that potential migrants calculated the financial costs and benefits of migration. He expected that those who migrated calculated greater economic returns in their adopted homeland than they could expect in their country of origin (Sjaastad in Massey et al., 2006). Similarly, Rogler (1994) found migrants engaged in constant comparisons between their country of origin and their new home, making a series of trade-offs or “dialectical exchanges between perceived gains and losses” (Rogler, 1994, p. 704). Benefits also related to educational and lifestyle opportunities, while losses related to loss of social circle comprising family and friends. However, strong networks providing emotional, material and information support in the host society partially compensated for losses (Rogler, 1994). Counter-streams of migration, or migrants returning to their homeland, are evident wherever there are flows of migrants (Lee, 1966) as a result of changes in the balance of gain and loss factors.

### Interpersonal Dialectics

Concepts from interpersonal communication research, such as Baxter and Montgomery’s notion of relational dialectics, based on the work of Bakhtin (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996), explain the ambivalence many migrants feel about both their host country and their country of origin. Ambivalence is part of any kind of relationship and is consequently evident in the migration experience. Baxter and Montgomery conceptualised relationships as being in a constant state of flux with the people in relationship experiencing internal contradictions or “pulls” or “tugs” in different directions. Bakhtin (in Baxter, 1994) saw dialectical tension as an integral

part of human experience with a centralising force pulling individuals together with others at the same time as a decentralising force pushes them apart. Baxter applied Bakhtin's thinking to interpersonal relationships identifying three major contradictions. Individuals experience contradictions between connectedness and separateness, certainty (predictability) and uncertainty (novelty), and openness and closedness.

Migrants can feel both connected with and separate from their country of origin as well as their host country. The simultaneous desire for certainty and uncertainty is also present in the migrant experience. New Zealanders moving to a new country which is as similar as they can get to their country of origin are satisfying their desire for new horizons (novelty) without placing themselves too far out of their comfort zone (predictability). Migrants also simultaneously experience varying levels of openness and closedness to their new country and its culture depending on their prior knowledge and access to local networks through, for example, work and sporting activities and this affects their level of satisfaction with their host society. The current study examines the ambivalence New Zealanders interviewed for project one experienced regarding their decision to move to Australia.

### Transnationalism Connections

A recent focus emphasises the possibility of migrants becoming transnationals; immigrants who build, maintain, and reinforce multiple and constant economic, social and emotional interconnections with more than one country (Vertovec, 2001; Waters, 2003), whose personal and working lives involve "multiple & constant interconnections across international borders" (Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995, para 2), and who "remain intensely involved in the life of their country of origin" (Gold, 1997, p. 20). Research into immigrant transnationalism, first conceptualised in 1992 (Glick-Schiller et al., 1992), focuses on the links migrants maintain with their country of origin and its effect on their identities (Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995; Glick-Schiller et al., 1992; Hannerz, 1996; Spoonley, Bedford, & Macpherson, 2003; Vertovec, 2001). Transnationals expand their perception of home to encompass "both here and there" (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004, p. 1180) experiencing attachment to two countries simultaneously (Gold, 1997), with transnational ties most likely when migrants' country of origin is close to their new home (Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt,

1999). Transnationalists consider migration should be studied from the perspective of networks, rather than individuals or households because “networks migrate” (Vertovec, 2003). Transnationalism explains the selectiveness of migration. It occurs in specific groups of people and along specific routes. Pathways of migration are created, in part, by earlier migrants paving the way for others to follow (Faist, 2000; Lee, 1966). Migration between New Zealand and Australia follow such pathways.

Transnationalism represents a shift in the way migration is viewed. Using a transnational lens to study the migration experience, the focus is on the attachments migrants maintain with families, communities and traditions in their country of origin as well as on ways migrants adapt to the country they have moved to (Vertovec, 2001). Transnationalism has opened the way for an understanding of “multiple possibilities of combining ‘here’ and ‘there’, absence and presence, ascription and disavowal ... across every widening distances” (Yeoh, Willis, & Khader Fakhri, 2003, p. 208) and has therefore provided an effective way of understanding life in a globalised world. This transnationalist focus is appropriate for the current study which seeks to explain both migrant’s motivation and the effect of migration on individual and group identity.

Three different types of transnationalism, economic, political, and socio-cultural, have been identified (Portes et al., 1999). Economic transnationalism relates to migrants with business interests in both their country of origin and their new country, and includes “astronaut families” (migrant families where the father [the astronaut] returns to the country of origin to continue business activities there) and “satellite kids”, typically teenagers living with their siblings in homes purchased by their parents and attending school in the Western country, while both parents return to their country of origin to work (Waters, 2003). Economic transnationalism is more common amongst the very affluent and those from low income backgrounds, specifically Asian business people who have migrated to Western countries, and those who send remittances to family left behind in poorer countries (Levitt, 2001). On the other hand, socio-cultural transnationalism relates to the maintenance of social connections and attachment to and maintenance of their cultural heritage (Kivisto, 2001; Portes et al., 1999).

As well as social and economic connections transnationalism can have a political dimension. Many migrants from countries experiencing political upheavals and

undemocratic regimes continue to work for political change from their new countries. For example, Tongans living in New Zealand actively work for the establishment of democracy in Tonga (Lewis, 2006). In addition, some countries make active efforts to retain political ties with migrants, as evident by the Italian government making provision in 2006, for Italians living abroad to be represented in the Italian parliament, which resulted in two Australian Italians being elected (Australian Broadcasting Corporation Online, 2006, April 12; Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2006). Accordingly, the current study examines the extent to which New Zealanders living in Australia interviewed for project one remained involved in New Zealand political activities.

Transnationalism is a useful lens through which to examine the experiences of contemporary New Zealand migrants to Australia, as the current study seeks to explore the effect of migration on New Zealanders' individual and group identities, and participants in project one demonstrated constant ongoing connections with both Australia and New Zealand. However, the relatively new concept of transnationalism has met with criticism.

While transnationalism has been accepted as a useful way of viewing the migration experience (Kelly, 2003), questions have arisen over whether the concept is already adequately explained by existing theories, whether transnationalism is an inevitable stage in the adaptation process of all migrants or only applies to a minority, and whether transnational connections last beyond the first generation.

Critics who argue the term transnationalism is overused, describes too wide a range of phenomena and suffers from "analytical fuzziness" (Vertovec, 2003, p. 64) (also Vertovec, 2001; Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004; Yeoh et al., 2003), consider its parameters must be set more clearly and it must be more rigorously evaluated if it is to be a useful analytical tool and add something significant to existing approaches to migration (Vertovec, 2001). Vertovec argued it would be useful to theorise a typology of transnationalisms, as Portes, Guarnizo, and Landolt (1999) have done, and the conditions that affect them, rather than adopt a single theory of transnationalism and migration (2001).



It is further argued that it is misleading and too simplistic to suggest assimilation and transnationalism are competing theoretical perspectives or analytical concepts. Some researchers argue assimilation and transnationalism are intertwined social processes (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004), or that transnationalism is one possible variety of assimilation because, while maintaining connections with their country of origin, transnationalists are also engaged in the process of acculturating to their host society (Kivisto, 2001).

Transnationalism was advanced as a new form of migration occurring in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, but critics argue transnational networks are not new as migrants have always maintained links with their homeland (Vertovec, 2001). For example, Polish migrants to the United States in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century maintained family ties and sent both letters and money back to Poland (Thomas & Znaniecki, 1927).

The extent to which what researchers are calling transnationalism is simply the manifestation of closer connections made possible by advances in transport and telecommunications has also been debated. Kelly and Vertovec argue that, while advances in transport and communication technology have made it easier to establish transnational networks, transnationalism goes beyond the maintenance of connections and is a new form of migration (Kelly, 2003; Vertovec, 2001). They argue, for example, that practices such as involvement in everyday family decisions in one's country of origin and the transnational childrearing of satellite kids (Kelly, 2003; Waters, 2003) represent new manifestations of social groupings.

Transnationalism has been linked to globalisation and global citizenship, but some transnationalists argue what immigration scholars refer to as transnationalism is usually its opposite; attachments that are highly particularistic, making it more accurate to refer to transnationals as "bilocals" (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004) or to speak of "global translocalism" rather than transnationalism (Appadurai, in Kelly, 2003). On the other hand, some commentators argue that rather than having two homes, transnationalists have no home as they become estranged from their homeland, but are always outsiders in their new country (Polyzoi, 1985).

There is also conflicting evidence about the extent of transnationalism. Portes (2003) argued the phenomena had been overstated, as the ethnographic case study approach, while providing rich data on the phenomena, had the effect of turning a minority phenomenon into one that seemed much more widespread. He argued that researchers needed to move beyond the case study approach to a combination of research methods including quantitative surveys, advice acted on in the current study. Portes cautioned against transnationalism being seen as the normal state for immigrants citing a large scale survey of South American immigrants to the United States where only 6% of those interviewed were transnational entrepreneurs, and 10-15% engaged in transnational political activities (Portes, 2003; Portes & DeWind, 2004). In contrast, Walton-Roberts (in Kelly, 2003) suggested transnationalism was more widespread, citing a 1997 survey of South Asians in Vancouver which indicated that approximately one-third had travelled to their country of origin in the previous year. It can be seen from the above examples that differing measures of transnationalism provide different results. Therefore, studies into the extent of transnational connections need to define the concept clearly and ensure questions asked accurately reflect the phenomena under investigation.

Some researchers argue poorer transnationals are left out of discussions on transnationalism (Ghosh & Wang, 2003), as it is assumed transnationals have the legal and economic freedom to travel between countries and access to new technology. Relatives in poorer countries of origin, for example, do not have access to computer technology so the Internet is not a means of keeping in contact with relatives (Westwood & Phizacklea, 2000, in Ghosh & Wang, 2003).

Questions have also been raised about the durability of transnational ties across generations. Kelly (2003) suggested transnationalism was a transient state which was part of the settlement process. Research is also needed into the extent to which transnationalism is confined to first generation migrants (Kelly, 2003; Kivisto, 2001; Portes, 1997; Vertovec, 2001; Waters, 2003). Accordingly, the current study in projects one and two examines whether migrants' attachment to and contact with New Zealand decreased over time.

While existing approaches, such as examinations of acculturation do encompass aspects of transnationalism, and the concept of transnationalism may need refining in relation to the above criticisms, it provides a framework for explaining the experiences of contemporary New Zealand migrants in Australia who are at home in both countries and maintain multiple links with their homeland as a result of the close physical proximity of the two countries, ease of travel, and the benefits of new technologies such as the Internet and SMS text messaging. Accordingly, in the current study transnationalism is examined in relation to the “attachments” and “connections” New Zealanders living in Australia have with both countries. Specifically, this study examines migrants’ maintenance of social, emotional, economic, and political links with New Zealand, whether they expand their perception of “home” to include both Australia and New Zealand, and whether networks of New Zealanders migrate to Australia. Transnationalism also provides a framework for exploring the effects of migration on identity.

#### Effect of Migration and Transnationalism on Identity

Migration to another country leads individuals to re-assess their identity because they now have a point of comparison. For example, the processes of adaptation, integration and culture shock discussed earlier in this chapter involve the migrant questioning their old identity. As noted in chapter 3, conceptualisations of identity are meaningful only through oppositions to other social categories with contrasting features (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, in Abrams et al., 2003). In particular, national identity is relational as we define who we are in contrast to what we are not (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004). Migrant groups “self-consciously reflect upon their identities” (Vertovec, 2003, p.655) often embarking on a process of “making values from two worlds fit” (Levitt, in Vertovec, 2003, p. 656) negotiating their understanding of who they are, the groups they identified with, and how they are to act in both their country of origin and their new location (Ghosh & Wang, 2003; Vertovec, 2003). This negotiation of identity both shapes and is shaped by their connections with more than one location and social order and, as noted in chapter 3, increased global interconnectedness has, paradoxically, led to a resurgence in differentiation between nations and cultural groups (Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995).

Transnationalists argue that the life-world of transnationals is wider and more complex than that of non-migrants or permanent migrants who have minimal contact with their country of origin (Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995). Complex factors affect the way in which transnationals construct, negotiate and reproduce their collective identities (Vertovec, 2001). Their identities are “fluid and flexible” and constantly being reworked through “simultaneous embeddedness in more than one society” (Huang, Teo & Yeoh, in Yeoh et al., 2003, p. 213). This fluid identification both draws on and strengthens transnational connections. Transnational’s “identities, behaviour and values are not limited by location ... instead they construct and utilize flexible personal and national identities” (Yeoh et al., 2003, p. 213). Transnationals have multiple identities. The identity they present to others is dependent on the context and other participants in the encounter, and a transnational’s identity changes over time.

Both personal and collective identities are constructed through a combination of internal (self-attributed) and external (other-ascribed) factors within specific social worlds (Vertovec, 2001), referred to as avowal and ascription (Collier, 2000). Consequently, transnationals experience conflict between the expectations of their host society that they both fit in with the norms of that society and adhere to their ascriptions regarding a stereotypes of their collective ethnic identity (Ghosh & Wang, 2003). Accordingly, this study compares the individual and group identities of migrants and stayers to see if New Zealanders in Australia exhibit more complex contextualised identities, consider they have a broader world view in comparison to friends and family left behind in New Zealand, and whether New Zealand migrants to Australia consider Australians have stereotyped views of New Zealand identity.

Anthropologists see transnationalism as a means to reconfigure thinking about the way time and space are viewed in relation to group identity and a recognition that groups are no longer “spatially bound ... or culturally homogeneous” (Appadurai in Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995, para. 9). Accordingly, the physical location of friendship groups of New Zealanders in Australia is examined.

Transnationalism has also impacted on concepts of citizenship (Portes, 2003; Vertovec, 2001). “The ‘portability of national identity’ among migrants has combined

with a tendency towards claiming membership in more than one place” (Vertovec, 2001, p. 575 ) resulting in a trend towards multiple citizenship, new legal definitions (Waters, 2003) and a “rethinking of rights and obligations surrounding migration, transnationalism and national identity” (Vertovec, 2001, p. 575 ). Governments can make structural allowances for a transnational reality by making it possible for migrants to hold dual or even multiple citizenship (Kivisto, 2001; Pearson, 2004), as is the case in Australia. Project two of this study examines the extent to which New Zealanders living in Australia take up Australian citizenship and their motivations for doing so.

Following this analysis of migration research and theory, an historical perspective on migration by New Zealanders and trans-Tasman migration is provided.

#### Migration by New Zealanders: Historical Perspective

New Zealanders have a history of continuous migration (Bedford, 2003; King, 1991). It is argued that the current trend of New Zealanders migrating across the Tasman in large numbers is a logical extension of past migrations. These migrations started with East Polynesians travelling to New Zealand around 800 years ago, and later migrating internally within New Zealand. This was followed by the migration of thousands of settlers from Great Britain in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century and the subsequent migration of Maori from rural to urban areas. The reasons for these migrations is analysed with reference to the literature on motivations to migrate.

The risk factors involved in the sea journey undertaken by the ancestors of the Maori, from East Polynesia to New Zealand about 800 years ago suggest there were strong motivational forces. While not entirely clear it is thought push factors included overcrowding and the subsequent scarcity of resources, and disputes with other factions in their country of origin (Belich, 1996). Thus, “preservation” (Tartakovsky & Schwartz, 2001) was the major motivating force. Subsequent population growth among the Maori, prior to the arrival of Europeans, was the catalyst for journeys and migrations within New Zealand for resources, trade, and vendettas (McKinnon, 1997). Once again preservation push factors were the catalyst.

The reasons for the later migration of British settlers were somewhat different. These migrants were keen to escape poverty, disease and overcrowding in industrial Britain and were lured by the promise of a better way of life in New Zealand (C. Bell, 1997), a combination of push and pull factors. Poor agricultural workers, most of whom came as assisted immigrants to the five New Zealand Company Settlements of Wellington, Nelson, New Plymouth, Dunedin and Christchurch, had reached their “migration threshold” (Zodgekar, 1990) as they were dissatisfied with conditions in the United Kingdom and motivated to act on their unhappiness. In contrast, capitalist groups of landowners were pulled by the lure of cheap land (King, 2003).

Substantial numbers of British migrants began arriving after 1840, when the Treaty of Waitangi established a formal agreement between Maori tribal leaders and the British. In 1840 the non-Maori population of New Zealand was about 2,000 and the Maori population was estimated to be around 70,000, having declined from an estimated 86,000 prior to European arrival (Belich, 1996). The ten years between 1840 and 1850 saw the balance between Maori and *Pakeha* change. While the Maori population decreased due to dislocation and introduced diseases, the *Pakeha* population soared. By 1858 the non-Maori population had risen to 60,000 and it was 80,000 by 1860. While most of the early immigrants came as assisted immigrants, there was also a flow of free migrants, many coming from Australia, notably in response to the discovery of gold in 1861 when the non-Maori population doubled in three years. Migrants lured by the chance to find gold could be classified as aspirers responding to pull factors, according to Taylor’s typology (1969). Those who migrated from industrial Britain for a better way of life in New Zealand, a chance to own their own land and be their own boss (C. Bell, 1997) could also be referred to as aspirers.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Maori migration from country to town occurred in large numbers between the start of World War Two and the 1970s. In 1951 only 20% of Maori lived in urban areas, but within two decades 58% were urbanised (McKinnon, 1997, Plate 91). Urbanisation has been attributed to an increase in social problems and “loss of culture”, as many Maori were no longer immersed in their traditional culture in the same way as when they were in daily contact with their extended family. However, this has been challenged by others who argue urban Maori have evolved strong and meaningful associations to the local land and community (Borell, 2005).

Metge, in her comprehensive ethnographic study of Maori migrants in Auckland in the 1950s, found that most migrants were young adults who moved to Auckland from rural tribal areas with little money to “make their fortunes” (Metge, 1964, p.124). However, Metge considered the importance of economic circumstances as a reason for leaving rural communities (push factor) was overstated, as in the majority of cases younger immigrants’ motives for leaving home were a desire for adventure and independence. They wanted to “try their wings” outside the familiar home community and to shake off the hampering authority and conventions of their elders (Metge, 1964, p. 128). According to Metge, Maori migrants were not ambitious to win a place in the *Pakeha* world, and few had social contact with *Pakeha*. Moving to Auckland was often a spur-of-the-moment decision which, once made, was almost invariably acted upon with a matter of days. Most immigrants initially went to stay with kinsfolk who, although often not consulted, were confidently expected to be welcoming.

Metge found that immigrants to Auckland retained their cultural values and practices, although sometimes in modified form, even after living in the city for a long time. “They felt strongly what they called ‘the pull of Maori heart’” (Metge, 1964 p. 223), and their values remained intact (Metge, 1964). In particular, migrants retained strong connections based on kinship ties, as well as Maori ideals of hospitality, generosity, and group loyalty, continuing to speak Maori and to use Maori forms of organisation and ceremonial, not only resisting pressure to abandon their cultural practices, but adapting them to their new environment (Metge, 1964). Metge noted Maori were an adaptive people with a history of combining the best of their traditional and western culture. Project one of the current study examines ways in which Maori adapt their culture when living in Australia.

#### Trans-Tasman Migration

Australia, particularly since World War Two, has a history of welcoming migrants, with “populate or perish” the motto for its post war immigration program (Holton, 1998). In 2004, nearly a quarter (24%) of Australians were born overseas, making it one of the most culturally diverse nations in the world (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006c). Migrants are accepted under Australia’s migration and humanitarian programs, which had a quota of 130,000–

140,000 for the 2005-6 year (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006c), however, New Zealand migrants have free access to Australia and are not counted as part of this migration program (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006a; Khoo, 2002)

Close links between New Zealand and Australia have existed ever since their settlement as colonies of the British Empire. In fact, from 1828 until 1840 New Zealand was governed from New South Wales. Movement between the two countries has always been considerable, starting with sealers, whalers and traders from New South Wales in the early 1800s (King, 2003), the direction depending on the economic situation in each country (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003; Hoadley, 2002). During the gold rushes of the 1860's and for the next 100 years more Australians moved to New Zealand than vice versa. The 1881 censuses of both Australia and New Zealand, for instance, indicated that there were 16,100 Australians living in New Zealand compared with only 6,800 New Zealanders living in Australia. This net gain in favour of New Zealand continued until the 1950s (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003).

Since the 1960s there has been a shift in the direction of migration with increasing numbers of New Zealanders living in Australia. By the 1971 Australian Census, 80,466 New Zealand-born were living in Australia, and by 1981 this had more than doubled to 176,713, more than three times the recorded number of Australian-born living in New Zealand (52,600). By 1991 the number of New Zealand-born living in Australia had increased by a further 100,000 to 276,073 (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003), while this had increased again to an estimated 449,000 by 2005 (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006a). Australia has by far the biggest New Zealand-born population outside of New Zealand, while in contrast, New Zealand had only the fourth largest Australian-born community, 56,259 in 2001 (Statistics New Zealand, 2001), after the United Kingdom, Greece, and the United States (Hugo, 2003).

As noted above, commentators have linked trans-Tasman migration to economic conditions in both countries (Carmichael, 1993) commenting that the increase in New



Zealand migrants during the late 1990s and early 2000s occurred during a period of strong economic growth in Australia (Khoo, 2002). New Zealand has struggled to maintain its standard of living over the last few decades while Australia's standard of living has improved (Catley, 2001b; Kerr, 2002; McLean, 2003).

*Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangements, Welfare and Residency Status*

Until 2001, Trans-Tasman migrants were able to visit, live and work in each other's countries without visas (the only restrictions related to the small number of New Zealanders with criminal records and serious illnesses), and to enjoy the benefits of citizenship in both countries. New Zealand migrants to Australia were automatically classed as Australian permanent residents and could become Australian citizens after two years' residence. However, during the 1990s restrictions were placed on New Zealanders' eligibility for benefits, and in 2001 new legislation meant New Zealanders could still move freely between the two countries, and could work in Australia without restriction, but could not become Permanent Residents unless they fulfilled the same criteria as other immigrants (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006a). The residency status of New Zealanders is assessed, at a cost of \$1,990 in 2006 (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006b), according to the same standards of skills-based points, entrepreneurship, or family sponsorship as migrants from other countries. This includes the criteria that migrants be aged between 18 and 44. In contrast Australians living in New Zealand continue to enjoy full benefits, as previously (Hoadley, 2003).

These measures were introduced because of the disproportionate number of New Zealanders living in Australia, compared with Australians living in New Zealand, and increasing associated social welfare costs to Australia, combined with concerns that New Zealand was being used as a backdoor means of becoming an Australian citizen by recent immigrants to New Zealand who did not meet Australia's more stringent residency requirements (in 1999-2000, 30% of New Zealand citizen arrivals were born outside New Zealand) (Birrell & Rapson, 2001; Cotton, 2001; Hoadley, 2002; Khoo, 2002; Wood, 2001). Part of this concern related to the fact an increasingly large proportion of migration to Australia, 34% of all settlers in 1999-2000, was not subject to Australian government immigration requirements (Khoo, 2002). The New Zealand Government had, since 1988 reimbursed the Australian Government for

payments of aged, widows, and invalids benefits to New Zealanders living in Australia. This was extended in 1995 to include solo parent and spouse benefits. However, due to increasing welfare payments to New Zealanders living in Australia, legislation came into force in 2000 requiring New Zealanders to live in Australia for two years before becoming eligible for welfare payments. Continuing concerns about the numbers of New Zealanders with non-New Zealand origins moving to Australia, coupled with concerns about a New Zealand government amnesty on overstayers, and the New Zealand Government's reluctance to shoulder further welfare costs for New Zealanders living in Australia, led to the more restrictive measures which took effect in February 2001 (Cotton, 2001; Hoadley, 2002).

The long term consequences of the new policy are unclear but it seems likely that two categories of New Zealanders will emerge in Australia; one category composed of New Zealanders enjoying full privileges, and the other composed of New Zealanders with neither prospects of residency nor social security privileges who will be further disadvantaged if Australia implements further restrictions, such as full school fees for non-residents. It was estimated that less than half the New Zealanders who moved to Australia in 1999 would qualify for permanent residency under the new system (Hoadley, 2002). Many New Zealanders living and working in Australia are ineligible to vote, to work in government departments, or to qualify for benefits such as the Higher Education Contributions Scheme student loans (HECS) or sickness benefits. Those participants in the current study who migrated less than three years previously were subject to the new skills based eligibility system, while those who were in the survey's 5-10 years or 11 years plus groups were eligible for the same privileges as Australians.

#### *Demographic Profile of New Zealanders Living in Australia*

It is difficult to provide accurate statistics on the number of New Zealand "migrants" in Australia, as while official sources distinguish between "permanent" and "long term" (those who do not intend to stay permanently but intend to stay for more than 12 months) arrivals in Australia, individuals' intentions frequently change (Bedford, 2001). The number of New Zealanders entering Australia with the intention of remaining for more than 12 months fluctuates somewhat from year to year, generally in accordance with economic conditions in the two countries. However, as noted

above, there has been a steady increase in the number of New Zealanders living in Australia since the 1960s. “Migration” peaked at 42,254 (combination of permanent and long term arrivals) in 2000-2001 as New Zealanders rushed to move to Australia ahead of the legislative changes in February 2001, dropped to 21,644 in 2001-2002, and to 16,364 in 2002-2003. Since then the numbers have increased (33,903 in 2004-2005) but not to the 2000-2001 level (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006a). While, traditionally the greatest number of migrants to Australia came from the United Kingdom, New Zealand contributed the largest number of settlers during the 1996-2001 census period (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2003b). However, there were again more settlers from the United Kingdom in the 2004-2005 year (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006d). At 30 June 2005, an estimated 449,000 New Zealand citizens were living in Australia (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006a). Return migration of New Zealanders cannot be measured in percentage terms because of a lag effect, but is considered to be significant (Bedford, 2001; Bedford et al., 2003; Lidgard & Gilson, 2002). Seven thousand three hundred and sixteen New Zealanders left Australia permanently in 2004-2005, but this figure included all departures, not just those leaving for New Zealand (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006a). Many returning New Zealand migrants had lived in Australia for less than two years (Madden & Young, 1993). The proportion of migrants of Maori ethnicity, labour market participation, geographic distribution, and other demographic information about New Zealanders in Australia are now provided.

Maori ancestry was reported by 32,060 or, 9% of the New Zealand-born Australian population, in the 2001 Australian Census (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003). This represents a lower proportion than in the New Zealand population where, according to 2001 Census results, Maori comprise 15% of the population (Statistics New Zealand, 2006a). A high proportion of Maori in Australia were recent arrivals with 25% having arrived between 1996 and 2001 (Te Puni Kokiri, 2004).

Compared with Australian-born residents, New Zealanders living in Australia have a higher participation rate in the labour market (77.7% compared with 67.4%), possibly

attributable to the relative youthfulness of the New Zealand born population in Australia, and a lower unemployment rate than the Australian-born (3.9% compared with 5.6%) (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2005), which may, in part, be due to recent arrivals being ineligible for unemployment benefit.

The 2001 Australian Census showed Queensland had the largest number of New Zealanders (127,320) followed by New South Wales (105,890), Victoria (55,520), and Western Australia (44,970). Males (50.6%) and females (49.4%) were almost equally represented. In addition, New Zealanders in Australia were predominantly of working age; in 2000, 62% of New Zealand-born residents in Australia were aged between 20 and 49 years. A large proportion, an estimated 65% in 2001, had arrived in the past 20 years (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2002). In 2001, 47% of New Zealand-born people aged 15 years and over held some form of educational qualification, a similar proportion to all Australians (46.2%), and to the New Zealand population as a whole. At the 2001 Census, the rate of Australian citizenship for the New Zealand-born in Australia was 36.5% compared with 75.1% for all overseas-born. This low rate of citizenship has been attributed to the privileged position of New Zealanders in Australia relative to other immigrant groups prior to 2001, where social security and other benefits were available without citizenship. The major religions for the New-Zealand born were Anglican, followed by Catholic, Presbyterian, and Reformed, with 25% stating “no religion” compared with 15.5% of the total population, possibly attributable to the relative youthfulness of the New Zealand-born population in Australia (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003).

#### *Studies of New Zealanders in Australia*

Despite their large numbers, New Zealand migrants to Australia are under-researched. Australian government initiated research projects into the settlement experiences of migrants do not typically include New Zealand migrants to Australia (for example, Madden & Young, 1993; Richardson, Miller-Lewis, Ngo, & Ilsley, 2002). Studies of trans-Tasman population movements have primarily been initiated in New Zealand and carried out by geographers and demographers who have relied on official data sources to map demographic trends and their effect on the economies of both

countries. One of the most comprehensive studies, edited by Carmichael (1993), examined trans-Tasman population movements, similarities and differences between New Zealand immigrants and the New Zealand-born population, and the economic effect of New Zealand migration to Australia. It concluded there was a need for research focused on individual decision-making and post migration experiences, which this study explores.

Studies of return migration to New Zealand provide important information about the extent to which New Zealand migrants act on the feelings of ambivalence observed in participants in the current study and what prompts them to return. Return migration of New Zealanders from a range of destinations has been studied extensively by researchers at New Zealand's University of Waikato (Bedford et al., 2003; Lidgard, 1993, 1994; Lidgard & Gilson, 2002), with Lidgard and Gilson (2002) noting that many New Zealanders had transnational careers that involved "shuttling" backwards and forwards across the Tasman or "circulating" through Northern Hemisphere countries. In a previous study, Lidgard (1994) noted that some returnees were "shuttle migrants" who have difficulty deciding where they want to live, as they felt ambivalent about their decision to return to New Zealand and subsequently left for overseas again. Lidgard also noted returning New Zealanders most frequently cited family ties as their reason for returning to New Zealand. These studies provide useful comparative data for the current study. In addition to studies of return migration, a three-year study of the settlement and circulation of New Zealanders living in Australia is being carried out by the Population Studies Centre at the University of Waikato between 2005 and 2007 (The University of Waikato, 2006), however results were not available at the time of writing.

Maori migration, reportedly one of the most under-researched aspects of trans-Tasman migration (Hempenstall, Mein Smith, & Goldfinch, 2003), was being studied during 2006 by a survey of Maori in Australia by Te Puni Kokiri, New Zealand's Maori Affairs Department which asked about reasons for moving to Australia, the maintenance of connections with family, *iwi*, politics and culture of New Zealand, and any identity problems they faced (Te Puni Kokiri, 2006). This report was not available at the time of writing.

Maori cultural identity in Australia was previously studied by anthropologist Paul Bergin (2002) who argued Maori were readily accepted into Australian society, with participation in sporting activities an important vehicle for Maori acceptance and integration. Bergin noted trans-Tasman sporting competitions led to strong identification with New Zealand, and that this trans-Tasman rivalry had both a boundary maintenance and boundary spanning effect. At the same time as dividing New Zealand supporters from their Australian counterparts, there was also a shared passion for the game (Werbnorm, in Bergin, 2002). However, while many first generation Maori migrants passionately supported New Zealand sporting teams, the allegiance of Australian-born Maori tended to be with Australia (Bergin, 2002), indicating that identification with New Zealand was lower for second generation Maori. Bergin's study provides useful comparative data for the current study which examines the cultural and national identity of both Maori and *Pakeha* migrants to Australia.

Most studies of the psychological effects of migration to Australia have focused on immigrants from cultures markedly dissimilar to Australian culture (for example, Colic-Peisker & Walker, 2003). However, Nesdale and Mak (2003) included New Zealand migrants in their study of the effect of "cultural distance" on migrants' adjustment and psychological health. In comparison with migrants from Hong Kong, Vietnam, Bosnia, and Sri Lanka, New Zealand migrants reported the highest level of acceptance by Australians, had more Australian friends, and reported the fewest psychological problems, while at the same time retaining a sense of pride in their cultural background. Project one interviewees echoed these views reporting few adjustment difficulties at the same time as retention of their New Zealand national identity.

### Conclusion and Research Questions Arising From Migration and Transnationalism Literature

Business globalisation and increasingly sophisticated technology have contributed to a lack of permanence about much modern day migration between first world countries. Many view the move to another country as something they will "try for a while" (Gold, 1997, para. 7), in the knowledge they can always return "home" at any time. Such migration, which occurs for a range of reasons including perceived economic

and personal benefits, can fruitfully be studied with regards to the interplay of factors that push migrants from their homeland and those that pull them to their destination. These factors differ depending on the age, life-stage, gender, and personality characteristics of the migrant.

While migrant adaptation to their new environment was previously the focus of studies of migrants in their new environment, a newer transnational approach, recognises that many present day migrants remain in close contact with their “homeland”, and may be attached to and feel at home in two countries simultaneously. The concept of transnationalism is a particularly useful way of analysing the experience of New Zealanders in Australia who are present in large numbers due to their unrestricted access to Australia, close physical, historical, and cultural connections, and ease of movement between the two countries.

Listed below are questions arising from this chapter. They are explored further in the project two survey of New Zealand migrants in Australia and through analysis of the migrants’ interviews in the light of the literature.

1. Will migrants who were dissatisfied with aspects of life in New Zealand be less satisfied with life in Australia than migrants who moved for other reasons (Lee, 1966)? (Project two)
2. Will migrants express more dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand than stayers (Zodgear, 1990)? (Projects two and three)
3. Are economic or lifestyle factors more important in New Zealanders decision to move to Australia (Faist, 2000; Massey et al., 2006)? (Project two)
4. Are New Zealand migrants pushed or pulled to move to Australia (Lee, 1966)? (Project two)
5. Do New Zealand migrants to Australia see themselves as pushed by circumstances (resultant, dislocated) or driven by their own identity and personality (aspirers) (R. Taylor, 1969)? (Project one)
6. Will New Zealand migrants see themselves as more work-oriented, have higher achievement and power motivations and lower affiliation motivation and family centrality than those who choose to stay at home (Boneva & Frieze, 2001)? (Project one)

7. Will Maori migrants to Australia be more likely than *Pakeha* to be secondary migrants, (those who migrated to be reunited with family) (Boneva & Frieze, 2001)? (Project two)
8. Will the reasons New Zealanders have for moving to Australia differ depending on the age, gender, and life stage of migrants (M. Bell & Ward, 2000; Von Reichert, 2001)? (Project two)
9. Are personal satisfaction issues, such as the desire for a change, or sense of adventure, factors in New Zealanders decision to move to Australia (Madden & Young, 1993)? (Projects one and two)
10. How do New Zealanders adapt to Australian society (Berry, 2001; Oberg, 1960)? (Project one)
11. In what ways do New Zealand migrants to Australia engage in comparisons of perceived gains and losses (Rogler, 1994)? (Project one)
12. How do New Zealand migrants to Australia express ambivalence about their decision to live in Australia (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996)? (Project one)
13. In what ways do New Zealand migrants to Australia maintain social, emotional, economic, and political links with New Zealand (Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995)? (Projects one and two)
14. Will migrants' attachment to and contact with New Zealand decrease over time (Kelly, 2003)? (Project two)
15. Will length of time in Australia increase the proportion of New Zealand migrants who regard both Australia and New Zealand as home (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004)? (Project two)
16. Will networks of New Zealanders migrate to Australia (Vertovec, 2003)? (Projects one and two)



## Chapter 6: Methodology: Projects Two and Three

Chapter 6 examines the rationale and methodology for project two, migrant survey, and project three, stayer interviews and survey. The research is grounded in issues and themes raised in project one interviews with New Zealand migrants in Australia, with the research methodology designed to be in keeping with the purpose and nature of the research and the questions guiding the enquiry (Patton, 2002). The overall purpose of the study was to explore New Zealanders' reasons for migrating to Australia and how they saw migration affecting their national and cultural identity. Following the project one interviews and examination of relevant literature on social identity, New Zealand and Australian cultural and national identity, migration and transnationalism, 32 specific research questions listed in Table 6.1 were generated to examine six themes: New Zealand identity, the migration experience, New Zealand migrants' identity in Australia, boundary maintenance, transnationalism, and comparisons between the identity of migrants and stayers. Hypotheses derived from eight of the research questions to test the statistical significance of survey responses, are also listed below.

*Table 6.1*

*Research Questions and Hypotheses Listed According to Themes and Data Source(s)*

<b>Research Questions</b>	<b>Data Source: Project 1, 2, 3</b>
<b>New Zealand Identity</b>	
1. What do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia and interviews with New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand reveal about their concept of New Zealand identity?	1, 2, 3
2. To what extent do the views of the two groups differ?	1, 2, 3
3. What is the function of "myths" of New Zealand identity, whose creation are they, and whose interests do they serve?	1, 3
<b>Migration Experience</b>	
4. Are New Zealand migrants pushed or pulled to move to Australia?	1, 2
Hypothesis 1: New Zealand migrants will be more motivated by pull factors than push factors or personal satisfaction factors.	2

5. Are personal satisfaction issues, such as the desire for a change, or sense of adventure, factors in New Zealanders decision to move to Australia?	1, 2
6. Are economic or lifestyle factors more important in New Zealanders decision to move to Australia?	1, 2
Hypothesis 2:	
Economic factors will be more important than lifestyle factors as reasons for migration.	2
7. Will migrants who were dissatisfied with aspects of life in New Zealand be less satisfied with life in Australia than migrants who moved for other reasons?	1, 2
Hypothesis 3:	
Migrants who moved to Australia because they were dissatisfied with aspects of life in New Zealand will be less satisfied with life in Australia than migrants who did not express dissatisfaction with New Zealand.	2
8. Do New Zealand migrants to Australia see themselves as pushed by circumstances (“resultant”, “dislocated”) or driven by their own identity and personality (“aspirers”)?	1, 2
9. Will New Zealand migrants to Australia see themselves as more work-oriented, as having higher achievement and power motivations and lower affiliation motivation and family centrality than those who chose to stay at home?	1, 2, 3
10. Will the reasons New Zealanders have for moving to Australia differ depending on the age, gender, and life stage of migrants?	1, 2
Hypothesis 4:	
Age and life stage of migrants will influence reasons for moving to Australia.	2
The 18-24 age group will be more likely to have moved for: “sense of adventure”, “stepping stone to further travel” and “came temporarily and decided to stay”. The 35-44 age group will be more likely to have moved for: “better future for self and/or children”, “job offer”, “more job opportunities” and “better standard of living”, and the 55+ age group to have moved because of: “family in Australia”.	
11. How do New Zealanders adapt to Australian society?	1, 2
12. In what ways do New Zealand migrants to Australia engage in comparisons of perceived gains and losses?	1
13. How do New Zealand migrants to Australia express ambivalence about their decision to live in Australia?	1, 2
14. Will Maori migrants to Australia be more likely than <i>Pakeha</i> to be secondary migrants (those who migrated to be reunited with family)?	1, 2
Hypothesis 5:	
Maori migrants are more likely than <i>Pakeha</i> to be secondary migrants (those who migrated to be reunited with family).	2
<b>Identity in Australia</b>	
15. What do the migration narratives communicate about the identity of New Zealanders when they live in Australia?	1, 2

16. Will New Zealanders living in Australia see themselves as more patriotic with a stronger sense of national identity than when they lived in New Zealand?	1
17. What do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia suggest about how New Zealanders adapt and change when they live in Australia?	1, 2
18. How do the roles, norms, and expectations of Maori New Zealanders change when they move to Australia?	1
19. Are Maori migrants to Australia more aware of the differences between the identities of the two countries and do they experience more difficulty adapting to Australia than do <i>Pakeha</i> New Zealanders?	1
<b>Boundary Maintenance</b>	
20. What do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia suggest about how New Zealanders maintain the boundaries of their national identity when living in a similar culture?	1
21. How do these narratives compare with the way New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand maintain the boundaries of their national identity with Australia?	1, 3
22. To what extent do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia and interview data from New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand present New Zealand and Australian identity as similar?	1, 3
23. In what ways do New Zealanders living in Australia evoke symbols of New Zealand identity and what is their function?	1
<b>Transnationalism</b>	
24. In what ways do New Zealand migrants to Australia maintain social, emotional, economic, and political links with New Zealand?	1, 2
25. Will migrants attachment to and contact with New Zealand decrease over time?	2
Hypothesis 6:	
Migrants who have lived in Australia for 0-2 years will be more attached to, and maintain more contact with New Zealand than those who have lived in Australia for 11 or more years.	2
26. Will length of time in Australia increase the proportion of New Zealand migrants who regard both Australia and New Zealand as home?	2
Hypothesis 7:	
Migrants who have lived in Australia for 11 or more years will be more likely to have expanded their perception of "home" to include both Australia and New Zealand than those who have lived in Australia for 0-2 years.	2
27. Will networks of New Zealanders migrate to Australia?	1, 2
<b>Migrants and Stayers</b>	
28. Will New Zealand migrants to Australia construct a different view of themselves and New Zealand in comparison with stayers?	1, 3

29. To what extent will New Zealand migrants to Australia see themselves as an in-group with more positive characteristics than their out-groups, those who have stayed behind and Australians?	1
30. Will those who stayed in New Zealand describe themselves more positively than those who have gone to Australia or, indeed, Australians?	3
31. Will migrants express more dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand than stayers?	1, 2, 3
Hypothesis 8:	
Migrants will express more dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand than stayers.	2
32. In what ways will migrants rationalise their decision to move from a country with many positive features and how will stayers rationalise the decision of family members to move to Australia, and their own decision to remain in or return to their homeland?	1, 2, 3

A mixed method approach utilising both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis techniques was used (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). Qualitative interviews and quantitative surveys with both New Zealand migrants in Australia and a broadly similar comparison group of stayers with family members living in Australia were conducted to allow for the triangulation of results, to establish convergent and divergent themes from different stakeholder's perspectives and utilising different methodologies.

A qualitative, phenomenological, grounded theory approach was appropriate for project one as it "gave voice" (Patton, 2002 p. 6) to differing perspectives enabling deep understanding of the phenomena being studied; in this case the effect of the migration experience on New Zealand migrants to Australia. Thus, detailed information gleaned from a small number of participants (31) was obtained. This approach made possible an understanding of the complex interplay of factors involved in the decision to migrate by enabling the researcher to spend time listening to interviewees without dictating the flow of discussion through asking a number of specific questions (Gold, 1997; Kontuly et al., 1995; Rogler, 1994; Segal et al., 2006; Stimson & Minnery, 1998).

While a qualitative phenomenological approach produces rich data, research findings using this method alone have been criticised because they are typically derived from small samples and lack supporting statistical data. In order therefore, to widen the sample size and provide opportunities for statistical analysis, the qualitative approach

used for project one was combined with quantitative surveys to test specific research questions derived from interview themes and an analysis of relevant literature. The survey extended the investigation to a larger sample than would have been possible using the more time intensive interviewing process, and provided a quantitative means of testing observed trends (Currall & Towler, 2003). This mixed methods approach combined the strengths of interviews and surveys so that the findings had both breadth and depth. It also provided the opportunity for both data and “methodological triangulation”; the comparison of multiple data sources, data collection, and analysis procedures (Denzin, in Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p. 460). Results were triangulated by comparing migrant survey data with interview themes and by comparing the interview and survey responses of migrants and stayers. While the survey results were not generalisable in terms of the findings being able to be extended to the whole population of migrants because of relatively low numbers and the snowball sampling method employed, they supplemented, confirmed and/or contradicted themes identified in project one and were a valuable part of the research (Wimmer & Dominick, 2006).

Issues of validity, whether what is measured is the same as what the researcher set out to measure; reliability, the extent to which repeated measurement of the same concept gives the same results; and generalisability, whether findings from one sample extend to another, or the entire population being studied (Patton, 2002) are discussed below. The results of the current study were valid as efforts were made to pose interview and survey questions that addressed the issues being studied. Reliability was addressed by using both interviews and surveys to ask the same questions, and intracoder reliability was established through the researcher recoding of 10% of the interviews. However, generalisability or “external validity” (Patton, 2002; Wimmer & Dominick, 2006) was not established due to the small and non-representative nature of the sample. Qualitative data is by definition not generalisable to any other sample outside the specific sample under study (Patton, 2002). The survey provided methodological triangulation of the qualitative interviews and gave additional insight to this qualitative data.

A drawback of written surveys was that they were expected to have limited appeal to Maori participants who are known for their oral tradition (Bishop, 1996; Bishop &

Glynn, 1999; H. Mead, 2003; Patterson, 1992). To ensure the Maori response rate was in keeping with their proportions in the populations being studied, particular efforts were made to access networks of Maori in both Australia and New Zealand with the result that the eventual number of self-identified Maori respondents was comparable with the proportion of Maori who make up New Zealand migrants in Australia and the Maori population in New Zealand. Eleven percent of the Australian survey respondents identified as Maori and a further 5% as both *Pakeha*/Caucasian and Maori, while Maori were estimated to make up 9% of the New Zealand-born population in Australia (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003). Twelve percent of the New Zealand survey respondents identified as Maori and a further 4% both *Pakeha*/Caucasian and Maori, which is similar to their proportion in the New Zealand population (15%) (Statistics New Zealand, 2006a). Thus both the Australian and New Zealand surveys can be taken as stratified, albeit opportunistic, samples.

The remainder of this chapter describes the methodological framework of projects two and three and the research design procedures, and provides information about participants, data collection, analysis, and verification.

### Methodological Framework

As discussed in chapter 1, there were three parts to the study. First, using the phenomenological approach in-depth semi-structured interviews with 31 New Zealanders living in Australia were conducted between February and August 2004. Second, written surveys developed out of analysis of key themes from the interviews and literature relating to migration and transnationalism were completed by 309 New Zealanders who lived in Australia, between February and October 2005. Third, structured interviews were conducted with 16 stayers who had family in Australia in June/July 2005, and 103 stayers with family and/or friends<sup>11</sup> living in Australia completed surveys between June and December 2005. Methodological details of projects two and three are now outlined.

---

<sup>11</sup> 23% of stayer survey respondents had friends, not family living in Australia

*Project Two: Survey of New Zealanders Living in Australia*

The migrant survey provided a means of triangulation and statistical analysis of the themes identified in interviews of New Zealanders living in Australia. Surveys have a number of strengths. They can be used to describe, explain, and explore phenomena, and are an effective way of measuring attitudes and orientations (Babbie, 2005), as was the case with the current study. Surveys are useful for gathering standardised information from a large number of people in a small amount of time at a relatively low cost and have been used by previous migration researchers (for example, Zodgekar, 1990). By using a standardised questionnaire, which asks the same questions of all participants, statistical analysis and tentative generalisations arising from that analysis were possible.

*Survey Design*

The survey design needed to be consistent with the theoretical framework, purpose and research questions (Patton, 2002). The overall purpose of the study was to discover what New Zealand migrants to Australia communicated about their reasons for the move, how they viewed their migration experience and the effect migration had on their national and cultural identity. The specific research questions had been generated from analysis of the themes identified in the project one interviews and from an examination of relevant literature. The survey made it possible to test, through the collection of quantitative data, the extent to which emergent interview themes regarding New Zealanders' motivation to move to Australia and the development of a transnational identity were supported by a wider group of New Zealanders living in Australia. Thus, the survey aimed to triangulate interview results.

When designing a survey care is needed to ensure the survey questions provide a valid measure of the concepts they aim to test. Survey validity is evident when the survey instrument actually measures what it purports to measure (Fink, 2003c). Care is also needed to ensure the survey asks unambiguous questions that are concrete and make sense to the respondent (Fink, 2003a). In addition, as the questionnaire was to be self-administered, it needed to include a statement of purpose, the questions needed to flow in a logical order, and the questionnaire needed to be visually appealing and clearly presented to maximise the likelihood of it being completed and returned (Bourque & Fielder, 2003; Peterson, 2001) (see Appendix 4, Migrant Survey).

The survey asked 29 questions covering respondents' demographic information, reasons for moving to Australia, maintenance of social, emotional, and financial ties with New Zealand, current national identification, whether they had become Australian citizens, how (if at all) they had changed since moving to Australia, likelihood of returning to New Zealand to live, and overall satisfaction with their decision to live in Australia (see Appendix 4).

In designing questions about reasons for moving to Australia, reasons identified by project one interviewees were listed and respondents indicated which of them applied to their situation. Respondents were also given the opportunity to add other factors. Testing the multi-faceted concept of transnationalism involved examining the transnationalism literature and interpreting the interview data to derive two key themes "attachment" and "contact" with New Zealand and constructing questions to assess these themes. These questions asked about visits to and visitors from New Zealand, phone, email, and Internet contact with New Zealand, where their closest friends were from, who they supported when Australia played New Zealand at sport, income source, whether their heart (emotional attachment) was mostly in Australia or New Zealand, and how they would describe their national identity if travelling outside Australia or New Zealand. In addition, the respondents' sense of belonging was measured by asking whether they saw themselves as belonging in Australia, New Zealand, or both countries. Draft questions were trialled on academic staff, who were themselves migrants to Australia, to obtain assessment on the validity of the constructs. Finally, the questionnaire was pre-tested on New Zealand migrants to Australia and adjusted in response to their feedback.

*Survey sampling methods and participants.*

After pre-testing, the survey was distributed using convenience and snowball sampling (Faugier & Sargeant, 1997; Penrod et al., 2003) to New Zealanders who moved to Australia as adults. This sampling method had limitations as observed trends could not be generalised to the New Zealand population in Australia (Patton, 2002), but, as population lists were not available it was the only possible approach. Thirty-seven surveys were completed at the 2005 Gold Coast Waitangi Day celebration, 66 surveys were posted to New Zealanders who responded to an article



about the project in the researcher's local newspaper, and 64 distributed to customers at "Kiwi" shops (where New Zealand products are sold), in Brisbane and the Gold Coast. The remainder (466) were distributed to contacts by means of snowball sampling to networks of New Zealanders living in Australia, with 58% posted to potential respondents and the remainder distributed by hand. The majority (89%) were distributed to New Zealanders living in South East Queensland, with small numbers of surveys sent to other Australian States. About half the project one interviewees were contacted and invited to complete the survey. A pre-paid return envelope was included with each posted survey to encourage return of the questionnaire. Of 633 surveys distributed 320 (51%) were returned, with 309 being included in the results (respondents who were themselves adult migrants to New Zealand were excluded as they may have had dual cultural and national identities).

It is acknowledged that those who complete surveys may be different from those who do not respond and, in addition, those who are sufficiently motivated to respond to a newspaper article are likely to be different from both those who respond and those who do not respond to a request to complete a survey (Fink, 2003b). Thus, this study was likely to attract participants who identified themselves as New Zealanders, as they may have been more likely to attend Waitangi Day celebrations, respond to a newspaper article, and shop at "Kiwi" shops. Efforts were made to counteract this by, for example, seeking out New Zealanders who had lived in Australia for upwards of 20 years known to be well integrated into Australian society. The non-random nature of respondents is acknowledged as a drawback of this survey. In addition, the generalisation of the survey results was limited as respondents were primarily resident in south east Queensland, and therefore the reasons they gave for moving to Australia cannot be presumed to be the same as those which might prompt New Zealanders to move to other parts of Australia.

#### *Survey respondent characteristics.*

Of the 309 survey respondents 42% were male and 58% female. Eighty-one percent identified as *Pakeha*/Caucasian, 11% as Maori, 5% both *Pakeha*/Caucasian and Maori, and 3% Pacific Islanders. Thirty-four percent had become Australian citizens. The majority (60%) were aged between 18 and 34 when they arrived in Australia with 20% aged 35-44, 12% aged 45-54, and 8% aged 55 and over. The majority (55%)

were aged between 35 and 54 when surveyed with 22% aged 55 and over, 19% aged 25-34, and 4% aged 18-24. Thirty-four percent of respondents had lived in Australia for 11 or more years, 27% 6-10 years, 21% 0-2 years, and 18% 3-5 years. Twenty-nine percent had lived in countries outside Australia and New Zealand, and 28% had lived in Australia on more than one occasion (see Table 6.2).

*Analysis of survey data.*

First, survey data were analysed using frequencies (percentages) and cross-tabs to uncover general trends. Further statistical analysis to test the significance of observed differences included the use of chi-square statistics, t-tests, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test, and Friedman Ranks tests, where appropriate. These methods are discussed more fully in chapter 7.

*Table 6.2*

*Migrant Survey Respondent Characteristics Expressed in Percentages*

<b>Sex</b>	Male	42
	Female	58
<b>Ethnic Identity</b>	<i>Pakeha</i> /	81
	Caucasian	
	Maori	11
	Both <i>Pakeha</i> & Maori	5
	Pacific Islander	3
<b>Age on Arrival</b>	18-24	27
	25-34	33
	35-44	20
	45-54	12
	55+	8
<b>Age when Surveyed</b>	18-24	4
	25-34	19
	35-44	33
	45-54	22
	55+	22
<b>Years in Australia</b>	0-2	21
	3-5	18
	6-10	27
	11+	34

<b>Australian Citizenship</b>	Yes	34
	No	66
<b>Lived Outside Australia &amp; New Zealand</b>	Yes	29
	No	71
<b>Lived in Australia more than Once</b>	Yes	28
	No	72

### *Project Three: Stayer Interviews and Surveys*

Stayer interviews and surveys provided a second means of triangulating themes identified in project one migrant interviews (the migrant survey also triangulated interview results), as well as adding another perspective to the examination of New Zealanders' reasons for migrating to Australia and how they saw migration affecting their national and cultural identity. The primary purpose of project three was to find out what motivations those who stayed behind in New Zealand attributed to their friends and family members' decision to move to Australia. Second, while it was not possible to obtain an independent measure of what migrants were like, and how they viewed their cultural and national identity prior to migration, there were likely to be similarities between migrants and their stayer family members and friends. Therefore, studying friends and family members of migrants who remained in New Zealand provided the views of a broadly similar non-migrant group, which made it possible to explore whether there was a difference between those who migrated to Australia and those who stayed in New Zealand.

In June 2005 the researcher travelled to New Zealand to conduct interviews. The purpose of these interviews with non-migrant New Zealanders with family members in Australia was to provide a point of comparison with the views of New Zealand migrants. Accordingly, interviews were structured rather than semi-structured, asking question relating to the themes identified in interviews with New Zealanders living in Australia. The interview questions, listed in Appendix 6, related to stayer's perceptions of their family member's reasons for moving to Australia and their subsequent experiences, stayers views on living in Australia, what kept stayers in New Zealand, characteristics of migrants and stayers, similarities and differences between Australia and New Zealand, and how they viewed New Zealand identity.

Interviews were tape recorded, with written permission (see Appendix 3, Interview Consent Form), and partial transcripts, leaving out hesitations and fillers and paraphrasing digressions (Kvale, 1996), were made by the researcher in order to obtain quotations to support derived themes.

A survey asking parallel questions to those in the migrants' survey was designed for stayers about why they thought their friends or family members who had migrated to Australia had done so. This survey of stayers provided information about how those who stayed considered the act of migration and those who migrated (see Appendix 8, Stayer Survey).

### *Sampling Methods and Participants*

#### *Interview participants.*

A comparison group of stayers with broadly similar characteristics to the Australian sample was interviewed. Due to privacy and anonymity considerations it was not possible to construct this comparison group wholly from family members of the Australian interviewees. All New Zealand participants had family members living in Australia at the time of their interviews, for periods ranging from four months to 27 years. These family members lived in Melbourne (5), Brisbane/Gold Coast (4), Sydney (3), Perth (3), and rural New South Wales (1). Of the sixteen interviewees five were male, 11 were female (including two married couples), and five self-identified as Maori. Interviewees were aged between 21 and 74. Stayers consisted of both New Zealanders who had always lived in New Zealand (seven of the 16 interviewees and 59% of survey respondents), and those who had returned to New Zealand after living elsewhere. It would have been preferable to have two groups of New Zealand interviewees; stayers, and returnees with a greater number of interviewees in both groups. This was not possible because of time and financial constraints regarding the length of time the researcher could remain in New Zealand. The high number of returnees in the study (9 out of 16 interviewees) is a result both of the kind of society New Zealand is, where many citizens have lived outside of New Zealand for period of time, and the fact the interviewer did not know the life history of participants prior to the interview. It is likely that returnees would have had to justify their decision to return to New Zealand to themselves just as stayers justified their decision to remain there but, because of the small number of participants, it is

not possible to reach definite conclusions about the extent of similarities between returnees and stayers.

Of the interviewees who had lived outside New Zealand the length of time ranged from 1 to 12 years. Five had lived in Australia, two in the United Kingdom, and one couple had migrated to New Zealand from Scotland 40 years previously. The interviewees worked in professional, administrative, and semi-skilled jobs. Full-time homemakers, retirees, and students were also included.

As demographic information about New Zealanders who have family and friends living in Australia is unavailable, it is not possible to determine how closely this sample represents the total population of New Zealanders with family and friends living in Australia. However, it would be reasonable to assume that women are over-represented as they made up 69% of interviewees.

*Stayer survey procedure and participants.*

A written survey of stayers with family or close friends who lived in Australia asked parallel questions to those asked of New Zealanders living in Australia. Nineteen questions covered demographic information, time they had spent in Australia, what they found attractive about Australia, why they thought their family member or friend moved to Australia, their current contacts with Australia, the likelihood of their moving to Australia, and the satisfaction with living in New Zealand (see Appendix 8, Stayer Survey).

The survey was distributed using convenience and snowball sampling (Faugier & Sargeant, 1997; Penrod et al., 2003) between June and December 2005. Ninety-eight surveys were distributed when the researcher was in New Zealand for a two-week period in June/July and the remainder (60) posted to family members of the researchers' contacts who had completed the Australian survey. Each posted survey was accompanied by a hand-written note explaining who had provided their contact details. Of 158 surveys distributed, 103 (65%) were returned.

Of 103 survey respondents (69% with immediate family in Australia, 31% with either or both members of their wider family; for example, cousins, or close friends<sup>12</sup>) 32% were male and 68% female. Eighty-two percent identified as *Pakeha*/Caucasian, 12% as Maori, 4% both *Pakeha*/Caucasian and Maori and 2% other ethnicities. This was not a matched sample with the migrant survey but it provided some means of triangulating the responses of the smaller number (16) of stayer interviews, and the migrant' survey. Forty-six percent were aged between 45 and 64 when surveyed with 18% aged 65 or over, 17% aged 25-34, 11% aged 35-44, and 8% aged 18-24. Ninety-five percent of respondents had visited or lived Australia, and 41% had lived in countries outside of Australia and New Zealand (see Table 6.3).

*Table 6.3*

*Stayer Survey Respondent Characteristics Expressed in Percentages*

<b>Sex</b>	Male	32
	Female	68
<b>Ethnic Identity</b>	<i>Pakeha</i> /	82
	Caucasian	
	Maori	12
	Both <i>Pakeha</i> & Maori	4
	Other Ethnicities	2
<b>Age when Surveyed</b>	18-24	8
	25-34	17
	35-44	11
	45-54	28
	55+	36
<b>Visited or Lived in Australia</b>	Yes	95
	No	5
<b>Lived Outside Australia &amp; New Zealand</b>	Yes	41
	No	59

*Analysis and Verification of Stayer Interview and Survey Data*

Interview data were analysed by categorising responses to the list of questions into themes and sub-themes according to interviewees' responses. These themes were identified with reference to the themes which arose from project one interviews with

<sup>12</sup> There was more contact between those who had family in Australia and those who did not but their general attitudes were similar.

New Zealand migrants in Australia and to the literature. Thus, the researcher looked for areas of convergence and divergence from the views expressed by the migrant group. Intra-coder reliability (Wimmer & Dominick, 2006) was established by the researcher recoding two (12%) of the interviews after the initial coding process was completed and reaching 100% agreement with the original coding.

Survey data were analysed in the same way as the Australian survey data: first frequencies and cross-tabs were computed to explore general trends then further statistical analysis to test the significance of observed differences employed the Mann-Whitney U test, where appropriate.

### Methodological Limitations

Inevitably, studies at this level have methodological limitations. These are discussed below.

The convenience and snowball sampling method employed for this study does not produce results which can be generalised to the entire population under investigation. Ideally a research sample is representative of the group it studies however, this was not possible in the current study as records of New Zealand migrants in Australia and stayers with family members living in Australia are unavailable.

Therefore, the migrant interview and survey sample is not representative of New Zealanders in Australia. Queensland residents who represent 36% of New Zealanders in Australia (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003), made up 89% of those to whom surveys were distributed. In addition, all interviewees were resident in south east Queensland or northern New South Wales, as financial constraints precluded travel to other parts of Australia.

Women were also over-represented in all samples. While women represent 49% of New Zealand migrants overall (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003), they made up 61% of migrant interviewees, 58% of migrant survey respondents, 69% of stayer interviewees, and 68% of stayer survey respondents. Although it might have been expected that men and women might have different demographic characteristics such as education level, profession, and

employment status and might not have been equally involved in the decision-making process, and that these factors could have influenced their opinions and responses, there were no gender differences regarding reasons for moving to Australia in the migrant survey sample. In addition, although the age composition of the New Zealand-born in Australia (including children) is relatively youthful with a median age of 37 years (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003), younger migrants were under-represented in the sample.

In addition, smaller numbers of participants in the stayer interview and survey samples; differences in the age and gender compositions, and proportion who had lived outside Australia of the migrant and stayer samples; and difficulties gaining access to a wider range of potential participants (migrants who are most integrated become invisible as they are indistinguishable from Australians, and stayers with family members or friends in Australia could only be accessed through contacts) limit the conclusions which can be drawn from the study and the generalisation of results.

While the proportion of self-identified Maori respondents (12% Maori and a further 4% both *Pakeha*/Caucasian and Maori) is close to that of the migrants' survey (11% Maori and a further 5% both *Pakeha*/Caucasian and Maori), the stayer survey includes a greater proportion of women (68% compared with 58% in migrant survey), older respondents (64% were 45 or older compared with 44% in migrant survey), and those who had lived in countries outside of Australia and New Zealand (41% compared with 29% in migrant survey). Thus although comparisons will be made between the two surveys, these can be indicative of trends only and not relied on as definitive data from matched sources.

Some participants in interviews had self-identified as Maori and, following the information provided in the interviews, some research questions sought to compare the responses of Maori and *Pakeha*. Accordingly, it was deemed necessary to identify the ethnicity of survey respondents, so the choices were: *Pakeha*/Caucasian, Maori, Samoan, Tongan, and "Other (please specify)", with respondents instructed to indicate the group or groups that applied. Although the word *Pakeha* is a frequently used short-hand way of referring to New-Zealand born whose roots were in Europe it has negative connotations for some New Zealanders (Dupais et al., 1999; Pearson &



Sissons, 1997; Tilbury, 1999, 2001). A small number (4%) of *Pakeha* respondents objected to the use of the word, stating they were New Zealanders or ticked the box but crossed out the word *Pakeha* (indicating they were Caucasian), some writing lengthy objections to the word in the margin.

In addition, although one-third of project one interviewees volunteered dissatisfaction with race relations in New Zealand as either a factor in their initial decision to migrate, or one of the factors on which they subsequently compared Australia more favourably, it was considered unethical to provide this as an option in the project two survey as some potential respondents may have found this offensive, or it may have “given permission” explicitly for respondents to make stereotyped comments about other New Zealanders. For this reason the deliberately vaguer options of “social problems in New Zealand”, and “political problems in New Zealand” were provided. Accordingly, respondents were not encouraged to be negative about any specific aspect of life in New Zealand.

Among migrants, the response rate for the questions on frequency of SMS and live Internet chat was low, presumably because few used these forms of communication. The New Zealand survey response rate was particularly low for the question regarding frequency of SMS contact with Australia. Feedback from respondents revealed the term SMS was not widely used in New Zealand as the activity is referred to as text messaging, but this had not been picked up when the survey was pre-tested. So vocabulary may have been a factor in the low response rate.

In both the migrant and stayer surveys, participants were asked to indicate all that applied from a list of 18 options, as the researcher was interested to know how many of the reasons identified by interviewees were also important for survey respondents. Project one interviewees provided a range of reasons for the move and the number of reasons presented varied widely among the interviewees. It would have been preferable, from a statistical point of view, to ask participants to rank the items in order of importance. However, it was judged this task of ranking these 18 items would prove difficult and therefore act as a disincentive to potential participants who might otherwise have completed the survey. Therefore the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks, the non-parametric equivalent of the t-test was used.

In hindsight, it would have been useful to have included a migrant survey question about the extent to which respondents retained political ties with New Zealand. This was not included because few interview participants indicated they had retained political ties with their homeland. However, triangulation of this finding with survey results would have been worthwhile. It might also have been useful to ask participants if they had moved to Australia on their own, or with a partner or as part of a family group, as there may have been differences between the three groups.

### Reporting of Results

Having outlined the rationale and methodological considerations for projects two and three, I will now provide the results of the migrant survey (chapter 7), and stayer interviews and survey (chapter 8).

## Chapter 7: Results Project Two: Migrant Survey

Three hundred and nine New Zealanders living in Australia completed a survey (Appendix 4) based on themes identified in interviews with 31 New Zealand migrants to Australia, and from literature on migration, cultural and national identity, and transnationalism. This provided hypotheses on which tests of statistical significance were carried out and the results of seven of these are reported below. For all tests a statistically significant result is considered to be less than .05.

### Relative Importance of Pull, Push, and Personal Satisfaction Factors

H1: New Zealand migrants to Australia will be more motivated by pull factors than push factors or personal satisfaction factors.

Survey respondents were asked to choose as many as applied from 18 reasons for moving to Australia (Appendix 4, question 9), which comprised nine pull factors, four push factors, and five personal satisfaction factors (see Table 7.1 below). Due to the non-parametric nature of the data, the non-parametric equivalent of the t-test, the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test, was employed to test the relative importance of push and pull factors. Because there was a numerical imbalance between pull (nine) and push (four) factors push factors were multiplied by 2.25. The pull factor was significantly more motivating than the push factor ( $Z(n=309) = 4.988, p < .001$ ), with pull factor rank = 143.98 and push factor rank = 136.69.

A Friedman Ranks Test, a non-parametric test of the relative importance of three related groups, was employed to test the relative importance of push, pull, and personal satisfaction factors. After scores were scaled to take account of the differing number of options in each category, there were significant differences between the three factors ( $p < .001$ ). Pull factors (mean rank = 2.28) were higher than personal satisfaction factors (mean rank = 1.91) with push factors (mean rank = 1.81) the lowest.

Table 7.1

*Percentage of Respondents Who Selected Various Factors as Reasons for Moving to Australia, Classified into Pull, Personal Satisfaction and Push Factors*

<b>Pull Factors</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Better climate in Australia	58
Better future for self and/or children	49
More job opportunities in Australia	44
Better standard of living in Australia	34
Family members living in Australia	30
Job transfer or job offer in Australia	17
Like Australians	9
Had/met partner in Australia	7
Larger population in Australia	6
<b>Personal Satisfaction Factors</b>	
Wanted a change	46
Sense of adventure	34
Came temporarily & decided to stay	14
Stepping stone to further travel	7
Came with partner, wasn't my choice	6
<b>Push Factors</b>	
Circumstances had caused a crossroads in life	23
Social problems in NZ society	23
Dissatisfied with other aspects of life in NZ	20
Political problems in NZ	16

#### Relative Importance of Economic and Lifestyle Factors

H2: Economic factors will be more important than lifestyle factors as reasons for migration.

Among the 18 reasons for moving to Australia (Appendix 4, question 9) from which respondents could select were four economic factors (relating to greater opportunities and a higher standard of living) and four lifestyle factors (relating to Australia's climate and family members, or a partner, resident in Australia) (see Table 7.2 below). Due to the restricted range of responses, the non-parametric Wilcoxon Signed Ranks

Test was employed to test the relative importance of the two related groups.

Economic factors were significantly more important than lifestyle factors ( $Z$  ( $n=309$ ) = 6.174,  $p < .001$ ), with economic factor rank = 109.64 and lifestyle factor rank = 92.40.

*Table 7.2*

*Responses for Economic and Lifestyle Factors Expressed in Percentages*

<b>Economic Factors</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Better future for self and/or children	49
More job opportunities in Australia	44
Better standard of living in Australia	34
Job transfer or job offer in Australia	17
<b>Lifestyle Factors</b>	
Better climate in Australia	58
Family members living in Australia	30
Had/met partner in Australia	7
Larger population in Australia	6

### Level of Satisfaction with Australia of Migrants Dissatisfied with Aspects of Life in New Zealand

H3: Migrants who moved to Australia because they were dissatisfied with aspects of life in New Zealand will be less satisfied with life in Australia than migrants who did not express dissatisfaction with New Zealand.

Respondents were categorised into two groups; “dissatisfied” (those who had indicated one or more of “social problems in NZ society”, “political problems in NZ”, and “dissatisfied with other aspects of life in NZ” in response to question 9) and “not dissatisfied” (those who had not indicated social or political problems in New Zealand or dissatisfaction with other aspects of life in New Zealand were factors in the decision to move to Australia). “Satisfaction” with Australia was measured by answers to the question “How satisfied are you with life in Australia?” on a Likert scale of one to five (Appendix 4, question 29). As the distribution was normal an independent–samples t-test was used to compare satisfaction for these two groups.

There was no significant difference in satisfaction scores for “dissatisfied” ( $M = 1.87$ ,  $SD = 1.134$ ), and “not dissatisfied” ( $M = 2.08$ ,  $SD = 1.287$ ;  $t(307) = 1.38, n.s.$ ). The magnitude of the difference in the means was very small (eta squared = .006). The hypothesis was not supported.

#### Effect of Age and Life Stage

H4: Age and life stage of migrants will influence reasons for moving to Australia.

It was hypothesized the 18-24 age group would be more likely to have moved for: “sense of adventure”, “stepping stone to further travel”, and “came temporarily and decided to stay”. The 35-44 age group were expected to be more likely to have moved for: “better future for self and/or children”, “job offer”, “more job opportunities”, and “better standard of living”, and the 55+ age group to have moved because of: “family in Australia” (Appendix 4, question 9).

Chi-square statistics, used because there were two sets of categorical data, revealed statistically significant results for four of these factors:

- 35-44 year olds were most likely to come to Australia for “better future for self and/or children” ( $\chi^2(4, n=309) = 24.944$ ,  $p < .001$ ), at 12.4 raw score values higher than expected, while the raw score value for the 55+ age group was 8.2 values lower than expected (see Table 7.3 below).
- As expected the 35-44 age group was likely to come to Australia for “more job opportunities”, at 5.2 raw score values higher than expected with 53% of this age group choosing this option, however, more job opportunities were also important for the 18-24 age group, at 7.6 raw score values higher than expected also with 53%, while it was unimportant for those aged 55 and over at 10.1 raw scores lower than expected with 0% ( $\chi^2(4, n=309) = 23.390$ ,  $p < .001$ ) (see Table 7.3 below).
- 18-24 year olds were most likely to come “temporarily and decided to stay”, at 6.9 raw score values more than expected with 22% of this age group choosing this option ( $\chi^2(4, n=309) = 11.848$ ,  $p = .019$ ) (see Table 7.3 below).
- 35-44 age group were most likely to come for “job offer” or “job transfer”, at 4.9 raw score values more than expected with 25% of this age group choosing this option, while the raw score for the 18-24 age group was 7.0 values lower than expected ( $\chi^2(4, n=309) = 11.333$ ,  $p = .023$ ) (see Table 7.3 below). However,

few respondents chose this option, which suggests a job offer or job transfer was not a relevant factor in the relocation of most of the sample.

There was no significant difference between age groups for “sense of adventure”, “stepping stone to further travel”, “better standard of living”, and “family in Australia” (see Table 7.3 below).

#### Proportion of Maori and Pakeha who were “Secondary” Migrants

H5: Maori migrants are more likely than Pakeha to be “secondary” migrants (those who migrated to be reunited with family).

Fifty-one percent of all respondents indicated they already had family members living in Australia when they moved there. However, only 30% of all respondents indicated that this was a reason for their migration (see Table 7.1). Of that 30% there was no difference between Maori<sup>13</sup> and *Pakeha*. This hypothesis, tested using a contingency chi-square test because there were two sets of categorical data, was not supported ( $\chi^2(2, n=301) = .339, p=.844$ ).

---

<sup>13</sup> Respondents who had indicated their ethnicity as Maori or both *Pakeha*/Caucasian and Maori.

Table 7.3

*Effect of Age and Life Stage: Reasons for Moving to Australia According to Age when Moved to Australia Expressed in Percentages and Deviation from Expected for Each Age Group*

Age on arrival	Reasons for moving to Australia															
	Better future		More job opportunities		Came temporarily & stayed		Job offer or transfer		Sense of adventure		Stepping stone to further travel		Standard of living		Family in Australia	
	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected
18-24	41	-6.3	<b>53</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6.9</b>	8	<b>-7.0</b>	31	-3.2	13	4.7	28	-4.6	26	-3.6
25-34	47	-1.5	44	0.1	12	-2.5	19	2.2	31	-3.0	5	-2.6	35	1.7	27	-3.7
35-44	<b>69</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>5.2</b>	18	2.3	<b>25</b>	<b>4.9</b>	43	5.1	5	-1.5	41	4.5	30	-0.4
45-54	58	3.6	37	-2.7	3	-4.4	24	2.7	42	3.0	5	-0.8	40	2.2	45	5.6
55 +	13	-8.2	0	<b>-10.1</b>	4	-2.3	4	-2.8	26	-1.9	9	0.3	18	-3.7	39	2.1



### Maintenance of Social and Emotional Ties with New Zealand

H6: Migrants who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years will be more attached to, and maintain more contact with New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years.

Attachment was measured by four questions asking respondents where most of their closest friends were from (Appendix 4, question 19), who they supported when Australia played New Zealand at sport (Appendix 4, question 20), whether their heart (emotional attachment) was mostly in Australia or New Zealand (Appendix 4, question 22), and how they would describe their nationality if travelling outside Australia or New Zealand (Appendix 4, question 23).

Chi-square statistics, used because there were two sets of categorical data, revealed significant support for these four questions supporting hypothesis six:

- More of the closest friends of respondents who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years were from New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years ( $\chi^2(6, n=307) = 21.575, p=.001$ ) (see Table 7.4 below).
- Respondents who had lived in Australia for 3-10 years were more likely to support New Zealand when Australia played New Zealand in sport at 8.3 raw score values higher than expected, while the raw score value for those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years was 8.9 raw score values lower than expected ( $\chi^2(4, n=302) = 14.050, p=.007$ ) (see Table 7.5 below).
- Respondents who had lived in Australia for up to 10 years were more likely to say their heart (emotional attachment) was mostly in New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years ( $\chi^2(4, n=301) = 15.429, p=.004$ ) (see Table 7.6 below).
- Respondents who had lived in Australia for up to 10 years were more likely to describe themselves as a New Zealander if travelling to a country outside Australia or New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years ( $\chi^2(2, n=303) = 37.344, p<.001$ ) (see Table 7.7 below).

Thus, while it was expected that respondents who had spent 0-2 years in Australia would exhibit greatest attachment to New Zealand, respondents who had spent 3-10

years in Australia showed greater attachment to New Zealand sporting teams, and greater emotional attachment than the 0-2 year group. These results are discussed and analysed in chapter 9.

*Table 7.4*

*Comparison of Time in Australia with Where Closest Friends Were From Expressed in Percentages and Deviation from Expected for Each Time Period*

Time in Australia <sup>14</sup>	Friends mostly from							
	New Zealand		Australia		Both		Other countries	
	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected
0 – 2 years	50	11.6	14	-2.9	33	-7.1	3	-1.5
3 – 10 years	32	0.9	14	-6.6	48	5.3	6	0.4
11+ years	20	-12.5	27	9.5	46	1.8	7	1.2
Overall	32		18		44		6	

*Table 7.5*

*Comparison of Time in Australia with Team Supported when Australia Played New Zealand at Sport Expressed in Percentages and Deviation from Expected for Each Time Period*

Time in Australia	New Zealand		Australia		No Preference	
	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected
0 – 2 years	81	-0.3	0	-3.3	19	3.0
3 – 10 years	87	8.6	4	-1.2	9	-7.4
11+ years	72	-8.9	10	4.5	18	4.3
Overall	81		5		14	

<sup>14</sup> Responses from New Zealanders who had lived in Australia for 3-5 and 6-10 years were integrated to provide an intermediate point of comparison, even though there may be differing responses from those who had lived in Australia for three years compared with those who had lived there for 10 years.

Table 7.6

*Comparison of Time in Australia with Country Emotionally Attached to Expressed in Percentages and Deviation from Expected for Each Time Period*

Time in Australia	Country Emotionally Attached to					
	New Zealand		Australia		Undecided	
	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected
0 – 2 years	77	6.9	22	-6.6	1	-0.3
3 – 10 years	72	7.9	26	-8.2	2	0.3
11+ years	51	-14.8	47	14.8	2	-0.1
Overall	66		32		2	

Table 7.7

*Comparison of Time in Australia with National Identification Expressed in Percentages and Deviation from Expected for Each Time Period*

Time in Australia	New Zealand		Australia	
	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected
0 – 2 years	98	10.4	2	-10.4
3 – 10 years	88	8.0	12	-8.0
11+ years	64	-18.5	36	18.5
Overall	82		18	

Contact with New Zealand was measured by three questions which asked respondents how many visitors they had from New Zealand (Appendix 4, question 12) and how often they were in phone and email contact with New Zealand (Appendix 4, questions 13 and 14).

Chi-square statistics, used because there were two sets of categorical data, revealed a statistically significant association for these three factors:

- Respondents who had lived in Australia for 3-10 years were likely to have had more visitors from New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years and 11 or more years ( $\chi^2(8, n=307) = 41.770, p < .001$ ) (see Table 7.8 below).
- Respondents who had lived in Australia for up to 10 years were more likely to make regular phone calls (at least fortnightly), while those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more were less likely to make regular phone calls (40%) ( $\chi^2(10, n=307) = 32.804, p < .001$ ) (see Table 7.9 below).
- Respondents who had lived in Australia for up to 10 years were more likely to make regular email contact, while those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years were less likely to make regular email contact (36%) ( $\chi^2(12, n=307) = 33.098, p < .001$ ) (see Table 7.9 below).

Once again, while it was expected that those who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years would have greater contact with New Zealand, the 3-10 year group had more visitors from New Zealand, and more frequent email contact than the 0-2 year group. These results are discussed and analysed in chapter 9.

Table 7.8

*Comparison of Time in Australia and Number of Visitors from New Zealand in Last Three Years Expressed in Percentages and Deviation from Expected for Each Time Period*

Time in Australia	Number of times have had visitors to stay in the last three years								
	None		1-2		3-4		5 or more		No response
	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%
0 – 2 years	19	5.2	31	4.9	27	-0.8	22	-9.3	1
3 – 10 years	4	-9.9	20	-6.0	22	-7.9	54	23.9	0
11+ years	15	4.7	25	1.1	36	8.7	23	-14.5	1
Overall	11		24		28		37		

Table 7.9

*Comparison of Time in Australia and Phone and Email Contact with New Zealand Expressed in Percentages and Deviation from Expected for Each Time Period*

Time in Australia	Regular contact (at least fortnightly)		Monthly		Rarely		No response or don't use
Phone							
	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%
0 – 2 years	76	11.7	16	-6.5	8	-5.2	0
3 – 10 years	62	6.5	24	-3.1	14	-3.4	0
11+ years	40	-18.2	35	9.6	25	8.6	0
Overall	58		26		16		0
Email							
0 – 2 years	64	3.7	8	-2.5	14	-1.3	14
3 – 10 years	59	11.8	7	-4.8	9	-7.0	25
11+ years	36	-15.6	17	7.3	22	8.3	25
Overall	52		10		14		24

Survey participants were also asked how often they used SMS and live Internet chat to keep in contact with New Zealand (Appendix 4, questions 13 and 14). Of total participants, 27% indicated they used SMS to contact New Zealand regularly (fortnightly or more frequently), 7% used live Internet chat regularly, while 32% used the Internet regularly to keep up with current events in New Zealand (Appendix 4, question 16).

#### Expanded Perception of “Home”

H7: Migrants who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years will be more likely to have expanded their perception of “home” to include both Australia and New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years.

This hypothesis was supported. Using chi-square because there were two sets of categorical data, a statistically significant difference between groups who had been in Australia 0-2 years and those who had been there for 11 or more years was found between those who saw themselves belonging (Appendix 4, question 24) in Australia, New Zealand, or in both countries ( $\chi^2(6, n=307) = 39.714, p < .001$ ) (see Table 7.10, below). Respondents who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years were more likely to see themselves as belonging in New Zealand (53%), at 16.2 raw score values higher than expected. Those who had lived in Australia for 3-10 years were more likely to see themselves as belonging in both countries (48%) at 7.8 raw score values higher than expected, while those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years were more likely to see themselves as belonging in Australia (43%), at 13.7 raw score values higher than expected.

Maori respondents were more likely than New Zealanders in general, to see themselves as belonging in New Zealand (56% compared with 28% for all respondents), and less likely to see themselves as belonging in both countries (32% compared with 42% for all respondents) or in Australia (12% compared with 30% for all respondents).

*Table 7.10*

*Comparison of Time in Australia and Sense of Belonging Expressed in Percentages and Deviation from Expected for Each Time Period*

Time in Australia	Sense of belonging					
	New Zealand		Both		Australia	
	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected	%	Deviation from expected
0-2 years	53	16.2	27	-10.0	20	-6.2
3-10 years	27	-0.3	48	7.8	25	-7.5
11+ years	13	-15.9	44	2.2	43	13.7
Overall	28		42		30	

### Other Details of Connections with New Zealand

The migrant survey also collected the following additional information not included in the results reported above. Fifty-two percent of survey respondents had encouraged other family members to move to Australia (Appendix 4, question 18). For 80% the move to Australia seemed like moving to another country rather than moving to another part of New Zealand (Appendix 4, question 10). Sixteen percent indicated their income, including investment income, came from both Australia and New Zealand, 2% entirely from New Zealand, while the income of the remaining 82% derived entirely from Australia (Appendix 4, question 21). Few respondents indicated they definitely intended to return to New Zealand in the future. Likelihood of returning to New Zealand to live expressed on a five-point scale (Appendix 4, question 25) had 10% indicate the highest ranking, 8% the second highest ranking, 19% the middle ranking, 21% the second lowest ranking, and 41% the lowest ranking. When asked what they considered they contributed to Australia (Appendix 4, question 28), migrants suggested they contributed skills (75%), a positive attitude to work (75%), experience (64%), citizenship qualities (41%), education (35%), and financial capital (25%). Migrants expressed high levels of satisfaction with their decision to live in Australia (Appendix 4, question 29). Satisfaction expressed on a five point scale had 48% indicate the highest ranking, 25% second highest ranking, 12% the middle ranking, 8% the second lowest ranking, and 7% the lowest ranking. The majority of respondents had visited New Zealand at least once in the last three years (see Table 7.11 below).

*Table 7.11*

*Comparison of Time in Australia with Number of Visits to New Zealand in Last Three Years Expressed in Percentages*

Time in Australia	Number of visits to New Zealand in last three years			
	None	1 - 2	3 - 4	5 or more
0 – 2 years	35	50	9	6
3 – 10 years	12	43	29	15
11+ years	14	50	24	11
Overall	18	47	23	12



*Migrants' Changes since Moving to Australia*

Migrants saw themselves as changing (Appendix 4, question 27) to become more positive, open to change, relaxed, and international in outlook since moving to Australia (see Table 7.12 below).

*Table 7.12*

*Migrants Changes since Moving to Australia Expressed in Percentages*

Type of Change	More	No Change	Less
Positive	60	36	4
Open to change	60	38	2
Relaxed	58	32	10
International in outlook	51	46	3
Tolerant	42	49	9

*Citizenship*

Only a third (34%) of survey respondents had become Australian citizens (Appendix 4, question 26) and for those who provided reasons (23% of those who had become Australian citizens and 31% of those who had not), practical considerations dominated, and it appears that when they felt no disadvantage they were slow to apply (see Table 7.13 below).

Table 7.13

*Reasons for Becoming, or Not Becoming, an Australian Citizen Expressed as a Percentage of Those Who Provided Reasons*

Reasons haven't become an Australian citizen		Reasons have become an Australian citizen	
Intend to, still thinking about it, haven't got around to it	31%	To get access to benefits (aged benefits, Centrelink payments, study, health care)	23%
Allegiance to New Zealand/ don't feel Australian	20%	To feel belong/ contribute	20%
No need/few benefits	16%	Ease of entry/ so can return/ simplicity/ might change criteria	18%
Haven't lived in Australia long enough	13%	So could vote	10%
Cost involved	7%	So could work for government/ employment reasons	8%
Unsure of criteria, process	3%	For children's future	8%
Ineligible (too old)	3%	Living in Australia permanently	5%
Don't like government policies	3%	Dislike NZ	2%
Australian by birth	2%		
Reasons unclear	2%	Reasons unclear	6%
Total	100%	Total	100%

Chapter 7 has presented results of project two, a survey of New Zealanders living in Australia. Chapter 8 presents the results of project three, interviews and surveys of New Zealand residents who had friends and family living in Australia conducted to provide comparisons with the views expressed by migrants. These results, along with those of the project one interviews with migrants, are analysed and discussed in chapter 9.

## Chapter 8: Results Project Three: Stayer<sup>15</sup> Interviews and Survey

This chapter presents the results of 16 stayer interviews and a survey of 103 New Zealanders who had family or friends living in Australia. Stayer interviews were conducted and surveys distributed in order to be able to compare reasons given by those who had migrated with the reasons attributed to migrants by those who stayed in New Zealand, and to compare migrants and stayers' views of their personal identity, and New Zealand and Australian cultural and national identity. Both the interviews and the survey asked parallel questions to those asked of migrants, for comparative purposes. Interviews and surveys were carried out at the same time, so the results are presented together organised into four themes; family member's reasons for migrating, stayers' reasons for remaining in New Zealand, New Zealand cultural and national identity, and boundary maintenance between New Zealand and Australia.

To provide an overall view for the reader, interview themes and sub-themes are listed in Table 8.1 below. The rest of this chapter elaborates on these themes and sub-themes providing illustrative quotes and survey data. Stayer results are compared with parallel results for migrant interviews and surveys, where relevant.

### Stayer Survey Respondents: Background Information

Respondents indicated their contacts in Australia included friends (48%), children (37%), siblings (36%), parents (5%), and other contacts or relatives (43<sup>16</sup>%) (Appendix 8, Stayer Survey, question 11). Thirty-eight percent of respondents had spent one to six months in Australia, 25% seven months to two years, 16% less than one month, 16% three or more years, and 5% had not visited Australia (Appendix 8, question 11).

---

<sup>15</sup>Stayers consisted of both New Zealanders who had always lived in New Zealand (seven of the 16 interviewees and 59% of survey respondents), and those who had returned to New Zealand after living elsewhere. Stayers and returnees volunteered similar views and exhibited similar characteristics.

<sup>16</sup>Including extended family (29%), grandchildren (7%), and in-law(s) (5%).

Table 8.1  
Overview of Stayer Interview and Survey Themes

Theme 1	Theme 2	Theme 3	Theme 4
Family Member's Reasons for Migrating <i>Interview &amp; Survey</i>	Stayers' Reasons for Remaining in New Zealand <i>Interview &amp; Survey</i>	New Zealand's Cultural & National Identity <i>Interview</i>	Boundary Maintenance between New Zealand & Australia <i>Interview</i>
<b>Pull factors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Family &amp; friends</li> <li>Like New Zealand</li> <li>Employment or study</li> <li>Like security</li> </ul>	<b>Positive views of New Zealand identity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integration of Maori culture</li> <li>Work ethic</li> <li>Good place to raise a family</li> <li>Egalitarianism &amp; dislike of formality</li> <li>Connection with the land, outdoor lifestyle</li> <li>Practical, do-it-yourselfers</li> </ul>	<b>New Zealand is superior</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Job/economic benefits</li> <li>Study opportunities</li> <li>Reunification with family</li> <li>Partner in Australia</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better attitudes towards indigenous peoples</li> <li>NZers are better workers</li> <li>Better place to raise a family</li> <li>Less American influence</li> <li>Less corruption</li> </ul>
<b>Push factors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stayers self-image and image of migrants</li> </ul>	<b>Negative views of New Zealand identity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nation of travellers</li> <li>Paranoia, gullibility, &amp; lack of confidence</li> <li>Racial tension</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NZers' communication style is preferable</li> </ul>
			<b>Australia is better</b>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Australians are more positive &amp; confident</li> <li>Freedom from racial tension</li> </ul>
<b>Personal Satisfaction factors</b>			<b>Additional forms of boundary maintenance</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sense of adventure</li> </ul>		<b>Maori views of New Zealand's identity</b> <b>Belief New Zealand identity was changing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Humour &amp; trans-Tasman rivalry</li> <li>Importance of Catholicism/ religion</li> <li>Do not want to unite with Australia</li> </ul>
			<b>Boundary spanning</b>

## Theme One: Stayers' Perception of Why their Family Member's Moved to Australia

RQ32: In what ways will stayers rationalise the decision of family members to move to Australia?

### *Interview Themes*

Stayer interviewees were more likely to attribute migrants' decisions to move to Australia to pull factors such as greater work opportunities than to mention push factors such as dissatisfaction with aspects of life in New Zealand. None of the 16 stayer interviewees mentioned racial tension as a motivating factor. This contrasted strongly with reports from the migrant group, in which 10 of the 31 interviewees cited racial tension as a factor motivating their move to Australia, or something they were pleased to have escaped.

### *Pull Factors*

#### *Job/economic benefits.*

Job or economic benefits was the most frequently mentioned factor in interviewees' perception of the reason their family member moved to Australia. This was cited as the primary factor for 6 of the 13 family members, and a contributing factor for a further three<sup>17</sup>.

The reason for the move was a job transfer ... given a promotion ... had to move to Sydney ... with regard to material acquisition he's far better off in Australia. He has an awesome job ... owns a beautiful home ... has all the trappings.

*(Maori<sup>18</sup> woman in late 40s talking about her brother-in-law who had moved to Australia 25 years previously when he was in his late 20s)*

He wanted to get back into skilled work ... aircraft mechanic ... he was working in unskilled work [in New Zealand] ... In Australia ... they were looking for tradesmen ... they've improved their way of life ... doing quite well. *(Woman*

<sup>17</sup> Thirteen family members who had migrated to Australia were discussed: the 16 stayers included two husbands and wives, and one mother and daughter talking about the same family member.

<sup>18</sup> Quotations from interviewees which have been labelled Maori were from those participants who self-identified as Maori.

*aged 66, talking about her brother-in-law who had moved to Australia 24 years previously)*

*Study opportunities.*

Three family members were reported to have moved to Australia for post-graduate study.

She wanted to study orthodontics and she got into Melbourne ... it was apparently the place to go for the course she wanted to do. (*Woman in early 60s talking about her daughter in late 20s resident in Australia for two years*)

*Opportunity to be reunited with family members.*

One interviewee cited the presence of other family members in Australia as one of the factors motivating her aunt's family to move to Australia.

*Australian partner.*

One family member was reported to move to Australia because she met her Australian partner in England, and after returning to New Zealand had moved to Australia to marry him.

*Push Factors*

Three of the five Maori interviewees cited the need to get away from negative influences as the reason their family member had moved to Australia. These were lack of employment opportunities, the negative influence of friends, and the desire for a fresh start after being an assault victim.

*Lack of employment.*

It was because of work opportunities ... in the 80s there were a lot of work opportunities for them there ... there weren't a lot in Hawkes Bay. (*Maori woman aged 21 talking about her aunt's family*)

*Escaping negative influences.*

He had got in with a bad crowd ... needed to get ... out of it ... in addition ... he had had trouble getting jobs in Wellington. (*Maori man in late 50s talking about his son who moved to Australia when he was in his late 20s*)

### *Personal Satisfaction Factors*

Three family members were reported to have moved to Australia due to a sense of adventure or because they wanted a change.

Adventure ... like the young people go to Britain ... for overseas experience. (*Woman in early 60s talking about her son who moved to Australia 16 years previously*)

### *Survey Results: Stayers' Views of Why New Zealanders Move to Australia and Factors Stayers Found Attractive About Australia*

Stayers attributed the departure of friends and relatives to economic factors such as more job opportunities in Australia (Appendix 8, question 12), and were much less likely than migrants to see dissatisfaction with aspects of life in New Zealand as a factor in their friend or family member's decision to relocate. In attributing causal factors in the migration decision of friends and family only 4% saw dissatisfaction with New Zealand life, while only 5% suggested that problems in New Zealand was a factor in making them see Australia as attractive (see Table 8. 2 below).

Although 57% of survey respondents said they had considered moving to Australia citing climate and the presence of family members in Australia as the key factors which made it attractive (Appendix 8, questions 8 and 9), only 4% indicated the highest ranking on a five-point scale (Appendix 8, question 19) when asked how likely they were to move to Australia in the future (7% indicated the second highest ranking, 27% the middle ranking, 18% the second lowest ranking, and 48% the lowest ranking).

Table 8.2

*Migrants' Reasons for Moving to Australia, Stayers' Perceptions of Reasons Friend or Family Member Moved to Australia, and Factors Stayers Found Attractive about Australia Expressed in Percentages*

Reasons	Migrants' reasons for moving	Stayers' perception of migrants' reasons for moving	Factors stayers found attractive about Australia <sup>19</sup>
<b>Pull Factors</b>			
Better climate in Australia	58	33	60
Better future for self and/or children	49	54	17
More job opportunities in Australia	44	62	48
Better standard of living in Australia	34	21	27
Family members living in Australia	30	24	53
Job transfer or job offer in Australia	17	34	N/A
Like Australians	9	8	20
Had partner in Australia	7	16	N/A
Larger population in Australia	6	7	6
<b>Personal Satisfaction Factors</b>			
Wanted a change <sup>20</sup>	46	34	36
Sense of adventure	34	21	21
Went temporarily & decided to stay	14	26	N/A
Stepping stone to further travel	7	7	13
Went with partner, not their choice <sup>21</sup>	6	5	11
<b>Push Factors</b>			
Circumstances had caused a cross-roads in life <sup>22</sup>	23	13	11
Social problems in NZ society	23	2	3

<sup>19</sup> In addition, 5% of stayers found nothing attractive about Australia.

<sup>20</sup> Wording changed to "provides a change" in question about what stayers found attractive about Australia.

<sup>21</sup> Wording changed to "partner wants to go" in question about what stayers found attractive about Australia.

<sup>22</sup> Wording changed to "at a crossroads in my life" in question about what stayers found attractive about Australia.



Dissatisfied with other aspects of life in NZ	20	2	3
Political problems in NZ	16	4	5

## Theme Two: Stayers' Reasons for Remaining in New Zealand

RQ32: In what ways will stayers rationalise their own decision to remain in or return to their homeland?

### *Interview Themes*

Stayers attributed their reasons for remaining in New Zealand to family connections (15 out of 16 interviewees), liking New Zealand (six out of 16), jobs and study commitments (five out of 16), and for security (two out of 16).

#### *Family/Friends/Whanau [Extended Family]*

The most frequently cited reasons for remaining in, or returning to, New Zealand was the presence of family in New Zealand, mentioned by all except one interviewee. In addition five interviewees mentioned the presence of friends, and four of the five Maori emphasised the importance of their tribal links.

My family. I wouldn't go anywhere .... We've got three children and both my husband and I have one brother and sister. (*Woman in early 60s, lived in New Zealand all her life*)

My family and my social network is all here ... really value having family around ... quite close to ... my parents. (*Woman in early 30s, lived in the United Kingdom for three years*)

Connections with extended family and tribal lands were seen as assets gained by living in New Zealand and factors in the return to New Zealand by Maori interviewees who had lived in Australia.

With [partner] and I both being Maori we were never not going to come home ... *whenua* [land], I have *manawhenua* [customary authority over ancestral land] here ... it's who I am ... it looks at me. It looks the same as me. It speaks to me ... it's my Maori self that would never let me not come home ... the connection ... it's who we are ... what drove me home is *whanau* [extended family] .... I'm from the Hokianga in Northland ... we go home at least every eight weeks. [Partner] is from the Coromandel and we go there about the same. (*Maori woman in late 40s, lived in Australia for 10 years*)

### *Like New Zealand*

Six interviewees said they had stayed in or returned to New Zealand because they liked life in New Zealand, referring to opportunities for recreational activities, New Zealand's climate, the presence of Maori culture, liking the city they lived in, and the belief New Zealand was a good place to raise children. These comments were made in connection with assertions that these aspects of New Zealand life were better than life in Australia and that they were happy in New Zealand.

I love the New Zealand lifestyle ... it's green, it's clean. You can run away from the city if you want to ... and I want to bring my children up in New Zealand. (*Maori woman in early 20s, lived in Australia as a young child*)

I've always liked Auckland ... fantastic inner harbour ... what holds us here is the boating ... we get out there most weekends. (*Man aged 56, lived in New Zealand all his life*)

### *Like Security*

Two returnees cited the desire for security among their reasons for returning to New Zealand to live.

Familiarity ... I'm not a particularly adventurous sort of person ... not a risk taker ... like the security of knowing what's what ... and as years advance ... complacency ... you've got a good job ... why upset a winning formula. (*Man in early 60s, lived in the United Kingdom for several years as a young man*)

I'm not very good at being transient ... I need roots ... somewhere to call my home. (*Woman in early 30s, had lived in the United Kingdom for three years*)

### *Stayers' Self-image, and Image of Migrants*

RQ30: Will those who stayed in New Zealand describe themselves more positively than those who had gone to Australia?

Stayers constructed positive views of themselves and less positive views of migrants. These differed from migrants' views of themselves and of stayers. In general, stayers constructed positive reasons for staying at home, seeing themselves as settled and stable. Some stayers viewed migrants as adventurous, confident and determined, while others viewed migrants as restless and unable to settle.

If you're contented with what you've got ... it makes you settled. It's not the case of not being ambitious ... it's a case of being content. Whereas, some people ... it's been the chasing of the extra dollar or thinking that the grass is greener on the other side. (*Woman in late 60s, had lived in New Zealand since migrating from Scotland in the 1950s*)

### *Survey Results: Reasons for Staying in, or Returning to, New Zealand*

Stayers' survey responses were similar to those of interviewees. Almost all (90%) stayer survey respondents cited the presence of family in New Zealand as a factor in their decision to remain New Zealand (Appendix 8, question 10). The presence of friends, a sense of belonging, established networks, and contentment with New Zealand were also factors for over 50% of respondents (see Table 8.3 below).

*Table 8.3*

*Factors which Made Stayers Remain in New Zealand Expressed in Percentages*  
*(indicated all that applied)*

Family in New Zealand	90
Friends in New Zealand	75
New Zealand is where I belong	59
Well established networks in New Zealand	52
Have everything I want in New Zealand	52
New Zealand is a better place to live/raise a family	39
Moving to Australia would be too uprooting	32
No advantages in moving to Australia/ not likely to be any better off	29
Job prospects in New Zealand	24
Other reasons	10
Australia is too Americanised	9
Climate too harsh in Australia	5
Don't like Australia/Australians	2

*Comparison Between Migrants and Stayers Level of Satisfaction with Life in New Zealand*

H8: Migrants will express more dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand than stayers.

To test this hypothesis dissatisfaction was measured by the number of respondents who chose one or more of: “social problems in NZ society”, “political problems in NZ”, and “dissatisfied with other aspects of life in NZ” (Appendix 4, question 9, and Appendix 8, question 9), when asked “reason(s) for moving to Australia” (Migrant Survey) or “which of the following is attractive to you about Australia?” (Stayer Survey). The migrants’ dissatisfaction score was significantly higher than that of stayers in a Mann-Whitney U test used to evaluate whether the medians differed significantly between these two independent samples (Mann-Whitney U,  $Z=5.166$ ,  $p<.001$ ), with migrants’ rank = 220.48 and stayers’ rank = 164.55.

### Theme Three: Stayers' Concept of New Zealand Cultural and National Identity

RQ1: What do interviews with New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand reveal about their concept of New Zealand identity?

RQ2: To what extent do these views differ from New Zealanders living in Australia?

#### *Positive Images of New Zealand Identity*

Along with migrants, stayers presented predominantly positive images of New Zealand identity although, unlike migrants, stayers saw New Zealand identity as changing. They volunteered all the positive aspects of New Zealand identity mentioned by the migrant group with the exception of the view that New Zealanders were renowned for their old-fashioned values and friendliness, and references to the ANZAC tradition. In addition, stayers viewed New Zealand as egalitarian, expressed the belief New Zealanders were practical, down to earth, do-it-yourselfers, had a connection with the land, and valued family connections. They also described “tendency to travel overseas” as a defining characteristic of New Zealanders.

#### *Integration of Maori Culture into New Zealand Identity*

Stayers considered Maori culture a unique aspect of New Zealand culture and *Pakeha* interviewees viewed race relations positively. Maori views of race relations in New Zealand are discussed later in this section.

There is a strong influence of Maori culture on *Pakeha* culture and *Pakeha* culture on Maori culture ... so ground in now that you don't ... pull it apart. (*Woman, aged 29, had lived in both Australia and Ireland*)

I love the Maori background ... if we can get it settled.... If we can be adult enough to look at what happened and realise there was a lot of wrong doing ... If you could take the best out of Maori culture and mix it with the other cultures ... it is a unique country. (*Woman aged 66, immigrated to New Zealand from Scotland in late 1950s*)

The Maori cultural component of New Zealand identity is becoming a key part of New Zealand identity ... the only way we're going to get our own unique flavour is with that Maori dimension. (*Maori man in late 50s, sojourned in Australia as a young man*)

### *Work Ethic*

As had migrants, stayers claimed that New Zealanders had a strong work ethic.

We're a go getter people ... both *Pakeha* and Maori ... not scared to have a go ... pioneering stock ... both came for that purpose. ... the stock that came were very work orientated, and hardy, and warrior like. The *Pakeha's* the same. (*Maori woman in late 40s, lived in Australia for 10 years*)

Australians ... haven't got the same work ethic as we have ... the white people that came to New Zealand, came with nothing ... they had to work. So our ancestors worked and it's been passed on ... it's starting to change ... the young people ... a little different to what it was ... [but] New Zealand people are hard workers. (*Woman in early 60s, lived in New Zealand all her life*)

### *Good Place to Raise a Family*

Two of the three young women interviewed said that New Zealand was a good place to bring up children. A 29-year-old woman considered that access to outdoor living was easier in New Zealand than urban Melbourne. She described the importance of family as a defining characteristic of New Zealand identity.

Family's really, really important ... that ... partially ... comes from Maori culture but not wholly. (*Woman, aged 29, had lived in both Australia and Ireland*)

### *Egalitarianism and Dislike of Formality*

Although stayers considered that class distinction was now more marked, they still felt egalitarianism was, to some extent, part of New Zealand identity.

Classless society although ... I don't think it's as classless as it's made out to be ... still to a large extent anybody can become anything ... opportunity to be self made. (*Maori man in late 50s, sojourned in Australia as a young man*)

Wife: Look at what Prince William was doing when he was here ... in there with the kids ... that is a thing that New Zealand people expect .... You can rub shoulders ... it's getting a wee bit more class ... distinction now.

Husband: ... there's a bigger gap now ... between the wage structures and that's creating an elite ...

Wife: You'd be rubbing shoulders with everyone at the same time and that was really good. (*Couple aged 66 & 74, immigrated to New Zealand from Scotland in late 1950s*)

### *Connection to the Land and Outdoor Lifestyle*

Along with the migrant group, stayers considered an outdoor lifestyle was a defining aspect of New Zealand identity. In addition, the stayers considered New Zealanders had a close connection to the land.

I like ... that connection with the outdoors ... in New Zealand ... you're ... close ... you can go and catch fish ... don't have to travel for miles ... immediacy of the outdoors ... passionate connection with the land. (*Woman in late 50s, lived in New Zealand all her life*)

New Zealanders have a ... strong connection with land and place ... people talk a lot about where they're from ... the actual land, the landscape ... a strong sense that they're outdoorsy people more than they actually are in their everyday life ..... it's part of how we see ourselves, not necessarily how we are. (*Woman, aged 29, had lived in both Australia and Ireland*)

### *Practical, Do-It-Yourselfers*

Stayers considered being a practical, down to earth, inventive, do-it-yourselfer was a defining aspect of New Zealand identity.

We are do-it-yourselfers because we've been a pioneering ... country and we had to ... trying anything ... giving it a go .... But ... that's dying. (*Woman in early 60s, lived in New Zealand all her life*)

The way we ... mark ... the difference between us and someone else is by doing something differently or creating a new way ... we're quite creative ... Kiwi ingenuity. (*Woman in early 30s, lived in the United Kingdom for three years*)

### *Nation of Travellers*

Several stayers described New Zealanders' tendency to live, work, and holiday overseas.

New Zealanders travel because we are ... isolated geographically ... it makes us go off ... inquiring nature ... adventure ... a lot of people have ... relations ... elsewhere in the world. (*Woman in early 60s, lived in New Zealand all her life*)

There's a strong sense in New Zealand that you haven't ... experienced things if you haven't gone somewhere else ... expectation you will go overseas to find a broader experience ... will make you appreciate New Zealand more. (*Woman aged 29, had lived in both Australia and Ireland*)

### *Negative Views of New Zealand Identity*

In addition to positive images, some stayers also described some negative aspects of their national identity, referring to paranoia, gullibility, lack of confidence, and racial tension in New Zealand.

### *Paranoia, Gullibility, and Lack of Confidence*

We're a paranoiac people ... our isolationism has formed that ... don't want people to interfere with our processes ... don't think we ever could ever lose contact with Australia ... yet the paranoia extends to the extent that we would never become a state of Australia ... don't interfere with us ... although don't leave us alone ... it's that dichotomy, that dilemma that breeds paranoia in Kiwis. (*Man in early 60s, lived in the United Kingdom as a young man*)



We tend to be gullible ... accept a lot of what we're told by our politicians and leaders rather than question it ... New Zealanders tend to bury their head in the sand ... go about living their own private lives ... we could be a whole lot more open. (*Man, aged 56, lived in New Zealand all his life*)

### *Racial Tension*

One noticeable difference between the accounts of migrants and stayers was that none of the *Pakeha* stayers spoke negatively about the emphasis put on indigenous issues or about racial tension in New Zealand, whereas 5 of the 16 *Pakeha* migrant interviewees had done this. Maori stayers were more critical about this as discussed below.

### *Maori Views of New Zealand's Identity*

Both Maori and *Pakeha* stayers agreed that identifying characteristics of New Zealand included a good work ethic, that it was a good place to raise a family, and that New Zealanders had a connection to the land. In addition, all five Maori described New Zealand cultural identity in terms of a Maori/*Pakeha* duality, while only two of the eleven interviewees who did not identify as Maori mentioned this duality. Maori considered Maori identity was undervalued and ignored by the *Pakeha* majority, and one interviewee's perception was that to be provided with opportunities in New Zealand, a Maori had to look Caucasian.

Some Maori interviewees presented ambivalent views about New Zealand race relations, initially expressing concern about the domination of the Maori by the white majority, but later commenting favourably on the efforts being made in New Zealand to accommodate Maori. The later comments functioned to soften the initial remarks and left the overall impression that these interviewees thought that, while there was room for improvement, New Zealand had adequate race relations.

We are in the final throes of mono-cultural colonial rule ... election year ... listen to the politicians ... "we're all one" and it's our one ... an attitude of, if we can

just nip it now we can stop this ... rise of Maori autonomy. (*Maori woman in late 50s, lived in Australia for 11 years*)

I don't know ... we would agree on what the single identity might look like if we were to try and create one ... got a lot to learn ... discussions are happening ... the two voices ... aren't hearing each other's voice. (*Maori woman in early 50s, lived in New Zealand all her life*)

[brother-in-law living in Australia] went to varsity .... His journey was ... different because he was a blonde, blue eyed Maori ... which meant ... he must have been something else ... the assumption was that he had otherness, and that otherness was what they [teachers] were talking to. (*Maori woman in late 40s, lived in Australia for 10 years*)

The same speakers, although unhappy about domination by the white majority acknowledged that efforts were being made to accommodate Maori culture into New Zealand's identity.

New Zealanders ... coming back ... been overseas ... realise ... how good things are between the races. That ... they need to nurture that and protect it ... New Zealand leads the world in indigenous relationships ... we ... need to sit back and pat ourselves on the back. (*Maori woman in late 50s, lived in Australia for 11 years*)

### *Belief New Zealand Identity was Changing*

Stayers saw New Zealand identity as changing, while migrants did not mention this aspect. Such changes involved an increasing separation from Britain, more cultural and ethnic diversity among its citizens, less emphasis on the do-it-yourselfer image, a decline in the work ethic, and the deleterious effect of the American media.

One interviewee described New Zealand as developing a separate cultural identity from Britain.

We're changing ... trying to find our place ... we belonged to someone else for a long time and we're now trying to pick out bits that we identify with from other cultures ... not going to happen in our lifetime ... but ... we've ... successfully cut our ties with... our English heritage and Scottish heritage. (*Woman in early 30s, lived in the United Kingdom for three years*)

Several interviewees referred to New Zealand's increasingly diverse population and the effect this was having on New Zealand identity.

The new Kiwi is ... different ... difficult to say who is really Kiwi now ... a lot of our characteristics and things that we held dear have changed ... and will continue to change with the influx of immigration, particularly Asian immigration ... don't know whether today you can define what a Kiwi is. (*Man in early 60s, lived in the United Kingdom as a young man*)

It's such a melting point now ... don't think there is a real New Zealand identity anymore. If you go back to the 50s and 60s ... if you ... had a car ... you had to fix it yourself ... you built your own home ... you built your own boat ... we've ... lost ... the true New Zealander identity. Now we've got so many different races here. (*Man aged 56, lived in New Zealand all his life*)

One Maori interviewee commented on the changing cultural mix in New Zealand society construing this positively as an argument for lessening the domination of *Pakeha* culture.

If you go down to any primary school ... and ... count the number of black headed children compared with the number of ... blonde, blue eyed ... population ... birth rate for Maori is increasing. We have a huge number of Pacific and Asian children .... The days of that dominant, monoculture ... straight out of ... England are over. (*Maori woman in late 50s, lived in Australia for 11 years*)

Another interviewee attributed changes in New Zealand identity to too much exposure to outside influences notably, American television.

It's changing. In the past it was more subtle, low key. Just get on and do it without making a fuss. Now flooded with world culture ... changing ... American TV ... reality TV ... changing with the younger generation. (*Woman, aged 49, lived in New Zealand all her life*)

#### Theme Four: Stayers' Boundary Maintenance between New Zealand and Australian Identity

RQ20: How does the way New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand maintain the boundaries of their national identity with Australia compare with the boundary maintenance behaviour of New Zealanders living in Australia?

Like the migrant group, stayer interviewees, while acknowledging many similarities between the two cultures, perceived New Zealand culture as different from Australian culture. In comparing the two cultures, stayers saw New Zealand as superior in most respects, but like those who had migrated conceded some advantages in Australia.

#### *New Zealand is Superior*

Stayers echoed the views of the migrant group that New Zealand had better race relations, better workers, that New Zealand was a better place to raise a family, New Zealand was less influenced by the United States, and that New Zealand had less corruption. In addition, stayers considered that, compared with Australians, New Zealanders' communication style was superior.

#### *Attitudes Toward Indigenous Peoples*

The superiority of New Zealand's treatment of its indigenous people was a theme in 6 of the 16 stayer interviews.

Australia is a more racist country .... If I had to choose I would prefer to be Maori than Aborigine. (*Woman aged 49, lived in New Zealand all her life*)

They [Australians] do not ... have a huge understanding of their indigenous culture ... nor do they want to ... our *Pakeha* partner in *Aotearoa* [New Zealand]

has a huge want to understand ... I do respect that about the Kiwi. (*Maori woman in late 40s, lived in Australia for 10 years*)

### *New Zealand has Less American Influence*

Stayers established a clear boundary between the two countries regarding the influence of the United States.

Don't like the closeness of Australia with the US ... see Australia as more sycophantic towards the USA. (*Woman aged 49, lived in New Zealand all her life*)

### *New Zealanders Communication Style is Preferable*

Half of the stayer interviewees mentioned differences between the communication styles of Australians and New Zealanders. While most were aware of the benefits of a direct communication style their comments were qualified with unfavourable comparisons.

New Zealanders are more subtle .... Australians are more outgoing and brash. This has positives and negatives ... greater tendency to go for the kill. (*Woman aged 49, lived in New Zealand all her life*)

Australians are tougher, more resilient ... depending on your viewpoint, I see them as brasher and ruder ... could soften that by saying ... more ambitious and ... hard edged and more used to a commercial environment. I see it as ... brashness or hardness. (*Man in early 60s, lived in the United Kingdom as a young man*)

Australians are ... much more vocal about their dislikes than New Zealanders ... in Sydney they're very brash, very loud ... very competitive. (*Maori man in late 50s, sojourned in Australia as a young man*)

### *Australia is Better*

In comparison to the migrant group, stayers made few comments regarding Australia being superior to New Zealand in some respects. There was, however, a perception

among some interviewees that Australians were more confident and positive, and that Australians were less likely to stereotype Maori.

*Australians are More Positive and Confident*

If you go there on holiday they're ... so positive, and upbeat ... very friendly .... New Zealanders are more reserved ... they [Australians] are terrific sports people ... there's an attitude ... more focused in a friendly sort of way ... I like that.

*(Woman in late 50s, lived in New Zealand all her life)*

*Freedom from Racial Stereotypes*

In Aussie it's easy .... Here ... it's really difficult being Maori ... but in Aussie ... there were no assumptions made .... My children had really positive learning experiences .... Here there are ... assumptions about Maori children. *(Maori woman in late 40s, lived in Australia for 10 years when her children were young)*

In contrast to the migrant group, none of the *Pakeha* interviewees talked about racial tension in New Zealand or suggested this made Australia seem attractive.

*Additional Forms of Boundary Maintenance*

Comments regarding trans-Tasman rivalry, the influence of Catholicism in Australian society, and the view New Zealand would never unite with Australia were examples of boundary maintenance behaviour which fell outside the view that either New Zealand or Australia was superior.

*Humour and Trans-Tasman Rivalry*

In contrast to the migrant group, there was a little emphasis on trans-Tasman rivalry in stayer interviews. It was only mentioned on one occasion; by a woman who had migrated to New Zealand from Scotland and therefore stood at the boundary of New Zealand identity.

There's ... a rivalry between the New Zealanders and the Australians ... you've had two colonised countries ... each of them ... fledgling ... sibling rivalry ... it's

really quite playgroundish ... it's almost an insecurity because ... they're not sure ... where they stand ... the newness of the countries ... each are trying to prove ... they can stand on their own feet. (*Woman aged 66, immigrated to New Zealand from Scotland in the late 1950s*)

#### *Importance of Catholicism/Religion*

A difference in Australia ... is the amount of people ... who are Catholic. ... There's Catholic people living in New Zealand but the Catholic culture isn't ... as strong as it is in Melbourne ... taken for granted in Melbourne ... has had influence over people who aren't ... Catholic ... not sure if religion has that much ... influence here ... in New Zealand. (*Woman aged 29, had lived in Australia for two years and Ireland for a year*)

#### *Views on New Zealand Uniting with Australia*

The idea of federation with Australia is absolute anathema to most New Zealanders ... we want to be different. (*Maori man in late 50s, sojourned in Australia as a young man*)

#### *Boundary Spanning*

Although boundaries were strongly maintained and differences asserted, stayers along with the migrant group acknowledged there were many similarities between the two countries and that the boundary between the two countries was blurred.

Similarities, there's a huge lot ... you can step off a plane ... there's no issues ... their ... way of life is similar. ... you just blend in. You forget very quickly that you're even in Australia. (*Man aged 56, lived in New Zealand all his life*)

One Maori returnee who lived in Australia for 10 years had some insight into both cultures which meant that her comments spanned the boundaries set up and maintained between Australians and New Zealanders and also between *Pakeha* and Maori. She demonstrates that for those who eventually return the experience of migration allows for new frameworks with which to deal with experiences.

I ... respect the Australian honesty. I hate ... how patronising our culture has become ... admire that about Australians. They're straight up. What you see is what you get ... the New Zealand *Pakeha* ... follow the English ... stiff upper lip and doing the right thing. As a Maori I ... appreciate honesty.... like to know where I stand. I'm not offended ... Aussie's ... you can have a good yarn. You can sit with an Aussie person and just talk ... Whereas ... New Zealand *Pakeha* ... conversations need to ... have a purpose ... there's an intensity about conversation here ... you don't find in Aussie ... the New Zealand *Pakeha* is very rigid ... Aussies ... I just loved it "oh ya bloody Kiwis" ... they're really honest, open, brash ... I like it because I know where I stand exactly. Here [in New Zealand] ... you don't ... we're so driven by doing the right thing here. ... I find it hard work here. ... Whereas I go into a Maori community ... you take us how you find us ... That's why I understand Aussie. That's why Maori and Aussie get on so well when we're over there. Because we're the same type of people. ... That's life bro, move on. (*Maori woman in late 40s, lived in Australia for 10 years*)

### Other Details of Survey Results

The stayer survey also collected the following additional information not included in the results reported above.

#### *Satisfaction Level*

Stayers expressed high levels of satisfaction with life in New Zealand (Appendix 8, question 18). Stayers' satisfaction expressed on a five-point scale had 43% indicate the highest ranking, 32% the second highest ranking, 21% the middle ranking, and 4% the second lowest ranking, with no respondents choosing the lowest ranking.

#### *Contribution to New Zealand*

When asked what they considered they contributed to New Zealand (Appendix 8, question 17), stayers suggested they contributed skills (82%), experience (75%),



citizenship qualities (66%), a positive attitude to work (64%), and education (64%), while a minority (23%) considered they contributed financial capital.

### *Frequency of Contact with Australia*

Stayers reported that phone and email were the most frequent channels of communication used to keep in contact with Australia. There was a low response rate from this group to questions on the use of SMS and live Internet chat to keep in contact with Australia (see Table 8.4 below). More migrants than stayers maintained regular contact (defined as at least fortnightly) with family and friends across the Tasman. Regular contact was maintained by phone (58% compared with 44% of stayers), email (52% compared with 40% of stayers), SMS (27% compared with 16% of stayers), and live Internet chat (7% compared with 4% of stayers) (Appendix 4 and Appendix 8, questions 13 and 14).

*Table 8.4*

*Frequency of Phone, Email, SMS, and Live Internet Chat Contact with Australia  
Expressed in Percentages*

Regular contact (at least fortnightly)	Monthly	Rarely	No response or don't use
Phone			
44	19	37	0
Email			
40	19	25	16
SMS			
16	4	10	70
Live Internet Chat			
4	3	12	81

Use of the Internet to keep up with current events in the other country was low for both migrants and stayers, however, migrants used the Internet to keep up with current events in New Zealand more than stayers used the Internet to keep up with current events in Australia (Appendix 4, question 16, and Appendix 8, question 15). Sixty-six percent of stayers said they rarely used the Internet to keep up-to-date with current events in

Australia, while 15% said they used it fortnightly or more frequently (compared with 32% of migrants), 13% indicated they did not have the Internet, and 6% said they used it monthly to keep up with current event in Australia.

### *Stayers' Perception of New Zealanders' Characteristics*

While migrants saw themselves as changing to become more positive, open to change, relaxed, and international in outlook since moving to Australia (see Table 7.12), stayers were tentative about describing New Zealanders (Appendix 8, question 16) although they did see themselves as relaxed (see Table 8.5 below).

*Table 8.5*

#### *Stayers' Views of Characteristics of New Zealanders Expressed in Percentages*

Description of New Zealanders	Yes	Maybe	No
Relaxed	65	31	4
Positive	41	51	8
Tolerant	39	52	9
International in outlook	35	46	19
Open to change	34	54	12

### Summary of Project Three: Stayers Interview and Survey Results

Stayers maintained their self-esteem and justified their decision to remain in New Zealand by attributing their friends and family member's decision to move to Australia to pull factors such as greater work opportunities, rather than dissatisfaction with aspects of life in New Zealand, and by viewing New Zealand's cultural and national identity positively, seeing New Zealand as superior to Australia in most respects. Stayers expressed high levels of satisfaction with life in New Zealand, citing family connections, a sense of belonging, and having everything they wanted, as their reasons for remaining there.

### Remainder of the Thesis

Chapters 7 and 8 have presented the results of project two, a survey of migrants living in Australia, and project three, interviews and surveys of New Zealand residents with family

and friends living in Australia. These results along with those from project one, migrant interviews are analysed and discussed in chapter 9, while chapter 10 discusses the study's implications and conclusions.

## Chapter 9: Discussion and Analysis of Results

This chapter analyses and discusses the results of the current study which were outlined in chapters 2, 7, and 8. Discussion is organised into six sections; perceptions of New Zealand's cultural and national identity, the reasons New Zealanders provide for migrating to Australia and their subsequent experience of life there, the identity of New Zealanders living in Australia, boundary maintenance between New Zealand and Australia, transnationalism, and migrants and stayers construction of identities and justification of decisions.

### Theme One: New Zealand's Cultural and National Identity

First, similarities and differences between the concepts of New Zealand identity presented by the migrant and stayer groups and then the function of the “myths” of New Zealand identity raised by participants, are analysed.

#### *Similarities and Differences between the Concepts of New Zealand Identity Presented by Migrants and Stayers*

RQ1: What do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia and interviews with New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand reveal about their concept of New Zealand identity?

RQ2: To what extent do the views of the two groups differ?

New Zealand identity has been variously described as egalitarian (King, 1991), disliking formality with a tendency to be critical of arrogance (Mouly & Sankaran, 2000, 2002), and based on a rural heritage (Sinclair, 1986). New Zealand also has a reputation for being a “great” place to bring up children (Ruth Brown, 1997). New Zealanders describe themselves as ingenious, hard working people (Ruth Brown, 1997; Sinclair, 1986). Sport is highly valued (J. Phillips, 1996b). In addition, the influence of Maori culture on all New Zealanders is considered part of what distinguishes New Zealand identity from other

Western cultures (King, 2003, 1991; Masters, 2004, February 28; J. Phillips, 1996b; Willmott, 1989). Each of these espoused characteristics was referred to by both migrants and stayers. However, there was little mention of the tourism marketing view of New Zealand as “clean and green” (C. Bell, 1996; Ruth Brown, 1997) which was only noted by one stayer.

While both migrants and stayers were largely positive about New Zealand identity, the stayer group was even more positive than the migrant group. Both migrants and stayers considered that Maori culture was a positive feature of New Zealand identity, that New Zealanders had a strong work ethic, that New Zealand was a good place to raise a family, had an informal lifestyle, a sporting tradition, and an outdoor rural lifestyle. In addition, stayers, while not volunteering the migrants’ views that New Zealanders were renowned for their old-fashioned values and friendliness, or mentioning the ANZAC tradition, considered that New Zealanders had egalitarian values, were practical, down to earth, do-it-yourselfers, had a connection with the land, and were a nation of travellers, while the migrant group did not mention any of these as defining characteristics of New Zealand identity. In addition, stayers presented more positive views than migrants about the integration of Maori and *Pakeha* culture.

There were also differences in the negative qualities of New Zealanders identified by both groups. Migrants described New Zealanders as judgmental and critical, while stayers considered them gullible and lacking self-confidence. Stayers were also more likely to qualify their responses. For example, stayers said New Zealand was regarded as a classless society but qualified their comments by saying that it was no longer as classless as it had been in the past. In addition, while stayers referred to the changing nature of New Zealand identity, migrants referred to a more fixed identity. Similarities and differences between migrants and stayers’ views on race relations in New Zealand, the changing nature of New Zealand identity and the ANZAC tradition are now discussed in more detail.

### *Views on Race Relations in New Zealand*

It was evident from both the interview and survey responses that migrants were less positive than stayers about the state of race relations in New Zealand. Some migrants expressed ambivalence about, or dislike of successive governments' attempts to uphold the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and to emphasise New Zealand's biculturalism. In addition, there were statistically significant differences in survey responses regarding the extent to which migrants and stayers perceived New Zealand to have social and political problems (see p. 176). Among migrant interviewees a range of views was evident with some speaking positively about Maori culture in New Zealand, and other migrants being negative about the "demands" of the Maori minority. In contrast, in the small sample of stayer interviewees, none of the *Pakeha* stayers spoke negatively about the emphasis put on indigenous issues or about racial tension in New Zealand.

There were also differences in how Maori and *Pakeha* stayers perceived the Maori contribution to New Zealand identity. All five Maori stayers emphasised the Maori/*Pakeha* duality of national identity and considered Maori identity undervalued, while this was less evident in the accounts of *Pakeha* stayers (mentioned by 2 of 11 interviewees) and in the accounts of Maori migrants (mentioned by 3 of 15 interviewees). There is considerable debate in New Zealand about differences between Maori and *Pakeha* cultures and the need for the mainstream majority to recognise distinctive values and behaviours of Maori. Therefore through the emphasis on these issues in the media, and through close connections with other Maori, as predicted by social constructionism which emphasises the co-construction of meaning (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Pearce, 1994, 1995), Maori participants constructed a view of themselves as central to New Zealand identity. They considered Maori have distinctly different attitudes, values, and beliefs (H. Mead, 2003; R. Walker, 1989) which needed to be considered whenever policy and practice was being discussed. In contrast those less involved with Maori constructed a view of Maori as less central to New Zealand identity.

### *Changing Nature of New Zealand Identity*

Stayers were hesitant about describing New Zealand identity as they saw it as changing rapidly and fluid rather than static. In contrast, migrants had a more typecast, sometimes idealised view of New Zealand identity. Nine of the 16 stayer interviewees referred to the changing nature of New Zealand identity as the country responded to immigration from non-Western countries, while this was not mentioned by any of the New Zealanders living in Australia. The presentation of New Zealand identity as fixed and unchanging by New Zealanders living in Australia suggests that living outside New Zealand meant migrants had, to a certain extent, a freeze-frame or unchanging view distant from the everyday reality of New Zealand life. Most had not kept up with current events in New Zealand via the Internet (only 32% indicated they used the Internet at least fortnightly). They held idealised, romanticised views of life in New Zealand derived from their experiences at the time they left, or their reconstructions of their childhood and earlier life experiences. For migrants who were not recent arrivals, lack of day-to-day contact with the reality of life in New Zealand and less exposure to the New Zealand media had lessened their awareness of changes taking place in New Zealand, such as, the effect of increased migration from Asian nations.

Their New Zealand identity was still an integral part of migrants' self-identity. They preserved some aspects but, in order to justify why they left New Zealand, they rejected other aspects. In this way migrants constructed a view of their motivations for moving to Australia. However, now they were resident in Australia migrants were constructing and reconstructing the migrant part of their identity as suggested by identity theorists (Brewer, 1991, 1999; Jenkins, 1996; Martin et al., 1998) but their New Zealand identity was static and fixed, as is discussed later in this chapter in relation to identity change in Australia. In contrast, stayers were constantly revising their New Zealand identity in a way that migrants did not. Still resident in New Zealand, stayers, aware of changes in New Zealand society, reconstructed their New Zealand identity to meet these changes (Abrams et al., 2003; Jenkins, 1996) and rationalised why they stayed in New Zealand.

While some academics argue that a more multi-cultural New Zealand has created a multi-faceted and increasingly complex New Zealand identity which makes it more appropriate to talk about New Zealand identities rather than a single New Zealand identity (Liu et al., 2005; Spoonley et al., 2004), the participants in this study had little difficulty identifying their concept of New Zealand identity. Predominantly, they espoused traditional images of New Zealand identity which primarily stem from *Pakeha* identity rather than the identities of Maori or migrants from places outside the United Kingdom. This is in keeping with studies in Australia which found that “ordinary” Australians tended to evoke “traditional” images of Australian identity (T. Phillips & Smith, 2000), such as mateship and giving others a “fair go”, while “experts” argued such images failed to represent Australia’s multi-cultural reality.

Interviewees in this study made reference to the three alternative stances described by Taylor in her study of the national identity of New Zealanders living in the United Kingdom; that New Zealand identity was a product of its British colonial origins and that New Zealand was gradually developing its own distinct identity as it broke away from Britain, that New Zealand had a bicultural identity, and that New Zealand had a multicultural identity (S. Taylor, 1996). Stayers saw New Zealand culture as changing due to a lessening British influence, recognised the Maori/*Pakeha* duality of New Zealand identity, and saw that New Zealand was becoming more culturally diverse. For example, one stayer interviewee described New Zealand as becoming a “melting pot”, lamented the loss of the “true” New Zealand identity, and spoke nostalgically about a time when New Zealand was more mono-cultural and life was simpler. In contrast, some migrants referred to New Zealand’s colonial past, and to Maori culture as an important aspect of New Zealand culture, but none of them referred to New Zealand breaking its ties with Britain, or to New Zealand having a multi-cultural identity. The differences can be attributed to the lack of day-to-day contact and tendency to freeze-frame their romanticised image of New Zealand cultural and national identity in the past.

Overall migrants, aiming perhaps to fit in to their new country, focused on how similar Australia was to New Zealand, a comparison not made by the stayers who were not



seeking to identify themselves with Australian society. Thus as discussed below in relation to boundary maintenance, stayers made more unfavourable distinctions between Australian and New Zealand cultures than did migrants.

### *Function of “Myths” of New Zealand Identity*

RQ3: What is the function of “myths” of New Zealand identity, whose creation are they, and whose interests do they serve?

Academics have noted concepts of national identity are partially “myth” (C. Bell, 1996; Ruth Brown, 1997), “invented” (R. White, 1981), or “imagined” (Anderson, 1991) out of evidence selected to fit an ideal. Interviewees in the current study echoed many of the “myths” of New Zealand identity noted by sociologists (C. Bell, 1996; Ruth Brown, 1997), such as New Zealand being a “great” place to bring up children, and New Zealanders having a strong work ethic. Returning to White’s comment that it is important to look at the function of ideas about national identity, who created them, and whose interests they serve (R. White, 1981), these myths, created and sustained by powerful and influential members of society such as politicians, served the interests of interviewees on both a personal and political level.

On a personal level, interviewees’ positive portrayal of New Zealanders functioned to make them feel good about themselves and also served to justify the decision of those who had remained in New Zealand or returned there after a period overseas, as predicted by social identity theory and cognitive dissonance theory. According to social identity theory, people tend to have enhanced notions of national identity because self-esteem is linked to group membership (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; S. Taylor, 1996). Therefore positive notions of New Zealand identity espoused by the participants in this study functioned to maintain or boost their self-esteem. In addition according to cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957), individuals highlight information which supports their beliefs and actions and ignore or downplay information which does not fit with their beliefs and actions to maintain consonance between the two.

On a political level, *Pakeha* migrants' views largely served the interests of the *Pakeha* majority, while *Pakeha* stayers were more likely to support the view of recent New Zealand governments, that biculturalism is an important ideal. In contrast, migrants were less supportive of the government's stance on race relations and less positive about New Zealand's economic future, which in turn provided a justification for their leaving New Zealand.

In making overt references to New Zealand's dual Maori/*Pakeha* identity, self-identified Maori stayers demonstrated their awareness of the contested nature of identity in New Zealand while *Pakeha* interviewees in the migrant group were more likely to assume that New Zealand identity equated with *Pakeha* identity.

#### *Summary of New Zealand Cultural and National Identity Considerations*

New Zealand migrants in Australia viewed New Zealand identity differently from stayers in several key ways. While migrants were overtly patriotic they also presented some negative expressions of New Zealand identity. Thus New Zealanders living in Australia can be seen as more ambivalent about New Zealand identity than those who had stayed in or returned to New Zealand. On the one hand they presented a romanticised, nostalgic view of life in New Zealand but, on the other hand, living in another country had made them more aware of negative factors, which are discussed more fully later in this chapter in relation to identity adaptation and change. In contrast stayers were more supportive of government policies relating to biculturalism and, while migrants spoke in generalisations, stayers spoke more of subtle nuances in New Zealanders' identity.

#### Theme Two: Reasons for Migration and the Migration Experience

The migration of large numbers of New Zealanders to Australia affects the Australian and New Zealand economies, the make-up of both societies, and families with members in both countries, through the so called "brain drain", workers' skill levels, industries that profit from migration such as the airline travel industry, multiculturalism, and family

relationships. Therefore, it is important to explore the attitudes, feelings and motivations that underpin the migration of New Zealanders to Australia, and how the migrants subsequently view life in Australia. These issues are examined below through analysis of migration narratives and survey data. Discussion of data is based around 11 research questions which examine motivations for migration itself, motivations for staying in Australia, and the relative attractions of both countries in the minds of the migrants.

*Relative Importance of Push, Pull, and Personal Satisfaction Factors, and  
Economic and Lifestyle Factors*

RQ4. Are New Zealand migrants pushed or pulled to move to Australia?

RQ5. Are personal satisfaction issues, such as the desire for a change, or sense of adventure, factors in New Zealanders decision to move to Australia?

RQ6. Are economic or lifestyle factors more important in New Zealanders decision to move to Australia?

H1: New Zealand migrants to Australia will be more motivated by pull factors than push factors or personal satisfaction factors.

H2: Economic factors will be more important than lifestyle factors as reasons for migration.

This study supports previous migration research that showed economic factors were important in a respondent's decision to migrate (Kline, 2003; Madden & Young, 1993; Moran et al., 2005). Both interviewees and survey respondents indicated that pull factors, notably job opportunities, were of greater importance than push factors in the decision of New Zealanders to relocate to Australia. Analysis of this study's survey responses indicated a statistically significant difference with pull factors more important than push factors and personal satisfaction factors significantly more important than push factors (see Table 7.1). In addition, economic factors were significantly more important than lifestyle factors for survey respondents (see Table 7.2). This indicates New Zealand migrants to Australia, unlike refugee and political asylum seeker migrants, are not forced from their homeland. Factors that attract them to Australia are stronger than those that

push them from New Zealand. They move to Australia because they find it attractive and perceive it to have opportunities not available in New Zealand.

While economic factors were clearly important, personal satisfaction and lifestyle factors were also evident with climate being the biggest single factor overall, mentioned by over half of survey respondents (58%), while nearly half (46%) indicated wanting a change was a factor in the decision to relocate, one third (34%) a sense of adventure, and nearly one quarter (23%) indicated being at a cross-road in their lives was a factor in their decision to move to Australia. This supports the findings of other studies of migration from one first world country to another that the desire for personal satisfaction, expanded horizons, and self-development were important factors in the migration decisions of this group (Conradson & Latham, 2005; Madden & Young, 1993), and observations that people tend to migrate when they are at a turning point in their lives (M. Bell & Ward, 2000). This suggests that moving to Australia is seen by New Zealanders as an option for personal, as well as economic, development.

*Level of Satisfaction with Australia of Migrants Dissatisfied with Aspects of Life in New Zealand*

RQ7: Will migrants who were dissatisfied with aspects of life in New Zealand be less satisfied with life in Australia than migrants who moved for other reasons?

H3: Migrants who moved to Australia because they were dissatisfied with aspects of life in New Zealand will be less satisfied with life in Australia than migrants who did not express dissatisfaction with New Zealand.

Previous studies suggested that migrants dissatisfied with aspects of life in their country of origin were likely to be less satisfied in their host country than those who did not leave out of dissatisfaction (Lee, 1966). However, in the current study New Zealanders dissatisfied with aspects of life in New Zealand were just as satisfied with life in Australia as those who expressed no dissatisfaction (see pp. 153/4). While most migrants held positive, almost rosy views of New Zealand, so much so that their new compatriots might wonder why they migrated to Australia, there were a number of migrant

interviewees, both Maori and *Pakeha* who suggested a major cause of dissatisfaction was racial tension in New Zealand (10 out of 31 interviewees volunteered this as a factor in their decision to relocate, or something they were pleased in hindsight to have left behind). In contrast, these interviewees were appreciative of life in Australia. Maori perceived Australia as a country where they were more able to be themselves, free of stereotypes and in-fighting, while both Maori and *Pakeha* who were dissatisfied with racial “issues” in New Zealand spoke positively about Australian policies of equal treatment for all (“here I’m just another person in society”), comparing this favourably to perceived “political correctness” and special treatment of Maori in New Zealand. These findings were echoed in the survey.

Dissatisfaction with race relations in New Zealand, as demonstrated by *Pakeha* perceiving Maori as receiving special advantages at the expense of other New Zealanders, and Maori seeing themselves as disadvantaged by negative stereotypes, as a factor motivating some New Zealanders to move to Australia indicates that New Zealand policy makers need to engage the hearts and minds of the people in order to gain support and commitment within the society. Migrant interviewees in the current study expressed dissatisfaction with Maori being advantaged at the expense of others (“Maori ... incredible payout at the expense of the whole country ... family farm ... leased in perpetuity ... rate set for 100 years, but they changed it”), rather than with the concept of biculturalism itself. This is in keeping with Sibley and Liu’s (2004) study of university students’ attitudes towards biculturalism in New Zealand which found most were supportive of biculturalism in principle but, especially those directly affected, voiced concerns about Maori receiving more than their fair share of resources.

Bicultural policies and implementation strategies have been a point of difference between the two major political parties in New Zealand at recent general elections (see for example, Brash, 2004). While the Labour-led coalition government was returned for a third term in 2005, a large minority of New Zealanders support the National party’s more conservative stance. The National party, in turn, periodically uses statistics regarding the number of New Zealanders “voting with their feet” by moving to Australia to evoke

concern and provide evidence of widespread dissatisfaction. While approximately one in four migrants did voice such dissatisfaction (see Table 7.1) a higher proportion did not, so policies for biculturalism cannot be regarded as the sole cause of migration.

*Pakeha* migrants' criticisms of policies towards Maori in this study were similar to the views expressed by Tilbury's more critical "conservatives" who said they were considering moving to Australia because they felt New Zealand's race relations policies constituted reverse racism (Tilbury, 1999). While in the current study no attempt was made to categorise migrants according to their views on Maori/*Pakeha* relations, migrants did make comments such as "I like the way John Howard will never say sorry to the Aborigines". The extent to which New Zealand migrants to Australia hold conservative political views is a factor which warrants investigation at some later stage, as some Australians may see it as a matter of concern if New Zealanders with conservative views on race relations were migrating at a greater rate than more liberal New Zealanders. Fuller investigation with a larger sample could test the extent of migration as a result of dissatisfaction with policies aimed at supporting equality of opportunity or biculturalism, or because of community prejudice in New Zealand towards Maori.

#### *Personality Characteristics*

RQ8: Do New Zealand migrants to Australia see themselves as pushed by circumstances ("resultant", "dislocated") or driven by their own identity and personality ("aspirers")?

RQ9: Will migrants see themselves as more work-oriented, having higher achievement and power motivations and lower affiliation motivation and family centrality than those who choose to stay at home?

New Zealand migrants to Australia come to a place already familiar due to a shared cultural heritage, media coverage, visits to family, as well as holidays (even 95% of stayers surveyed had visited Australia). Migration theories which attempt to explain the types of people likely to migrate are not usually concerned with such closely connected societies. However, Taylor's three categories of migrants, resultant, dislocated and

aspirers, could all be discerned among New Zealanders who had moved to Australia. That said, most migrants did talk about the experience as if they were proactive in the decision, creating their identity as ambitious, goal oriented, risk taking aspirers.

Some New Zealand migrants to Australia saw themselves as pushed by circumstances. These include those made redundant or unable to find work in their chosen field in New Zealand (resultant), women who moved to Australia reluctantly to accompany their spouse (dislocated), and migrants whose main motivation was to be reunited with family members living in Australia (dislocated). Previously researchers have suggested that proactive migrants would be more satisfied (Lee, 1966), however in the current study migrants who moved to be reunited with family members exhibited satisfaction at the same high levels as other migrants. These high satisfaction levels can be explained by the presence of family being a source of satisfaction for migrants with high family centrality.

Migration researchers attempting to explain why migration occurs from some areas and not from others in similar situations, and similarly by some people and not by others in these areas (Faist, 2000), suggest there are differences in personality characteristics between migrants and stayers. Ambitious, innovative and diligent people are considered likely to migrate from countries undervaluing their skills to countries valuing them more highly (Freeman, 1999). In addition, many migrants are considered to be aspirers; people who migrate because their aspirations are not met in their country of origin (R. Taylor, 1969). Boneva and Frieze (2001) proposed a set of personality characteristics differentiating migrators from those who stayed in their country of origin, suggesting primary migrants (those individuals who made the initial decision to migrate) were more work-oriented, had higher achievement and power motivations and lower affiliation motivation and family centrality than those who chose to stay at home.

Data from interviews in the current study show some support for Freeman and Boneva and Frieze's proposal, as migrants' self image was that of hard working, achievement oriented, forward thinkers. However, New Zealand migrants still maintained close connections with family. Sometimes, in fact, the reason for migration was to connect with

family members already in Australia. Thirty percent of survey respondents cited the presence of family members as a factor in the decision to move to Australia (see Table 7.1), and 52% indicated they had encouraged other family members to move to Australia. While stayers did emphasise the importance of family more strongly than the migrant group, migrants expressed regrets about lack of contact with family members left behind. Lidgard and Gilson's findings that family ties were the most common reason for return migration to New Zealand (2002) were supported in this study, as those who had returned to live in New Zealand cited "family ties" as a reason to return. Thus, in this study family ties both promoted and restricted migration. It seems New Zealand migrants are happy in Australia, but many are happier when their family members also live there.

However, New Zealanders who place a high value on family relationships can both live in Australia and maintain family contact even when family members remain in New Zealand. Because of relative proximity, a common language, frequent and cheap travel, telecommunications, email, and the existence of Australian-based family networks, New Zealand migrants to Australia are not as separated from family connections as migrant groups in other places and times have been, or indeed as east coast Australians are separated from family in Western Australia. Dislocated migrants who have moved to Australia to accompany their spouse or to be reunited with family already living in Australia have, arguably, moved because of high family centrality. It is also noteworthy that, in New Zealand's highly mobile society where family members live in different parts of the country, it may be more time and cost effective to travel from Australia to family members in New Zealand, than to travel from one part of New Zealand to another (Gamble, 1998, December 29).

#### *Effect of Age, Gender, and Life-Stage*

RQ10: Will the reasons New Zealanders have for moving to Australia differ depending on the age, gender, and life stage of migrants?

H5: Age and life stage of migrants will influence reasons for moving to Australia.

It was hypothesized the 18-24 age group would move to Australia for personal fulfilment reasons rather than more serious home and family reasons and be more likely to see the



move as temporary, while the 35-44 age group were expected to migrate to provide a better financial future for their families, and those over 55 were expected to move to be reunited with children and other family members already in Australia.

While some of these expectations were supported there were in fact, few clear-cut differences between age groups. As expected, 35-44-year-olds were most likely to come to Australia for “better future for self and/or children”, and “job offer or job transfer in Australia”, but both 18-24 and 35-44-year-olds listed “more job opportunities” as a high priority for migration, while 18-24-year-olds were most likely to come to Australia temporarily and stay (see Table 7.3). It is noteworthy that more job opportunities were not only a factor for 35-44-year-olds but for 18-24-year-olds. This may be due to many 18-24-year-olds being in a career development phase of life and perceiving Australia to have career and skill development benefits.

“Sense of adventure” was expected to be a motivator for 18-24-year-olds however, this was more of a motivator for the 35 to 54-year-olds (see Table 7.3). Perhaps the 35 to 54-year-olds had somewhat limited options and had reached a life-stage where they were less willing to take large risks. Moving to Australia, therefore, represented one of their few options for “adventure”. It was relatively safe but boosted their self-image by making them feel adventurousness and enabling them to get out of a rut. Young people with a sense of adventure may have had more options further afield and fewer responsibilities.

Some studies have indicated that the migration experience of men and women differs, however in this study there were no significant differences between men and women regarding reasons for migrating, attachment to, or continued contact with New Zealand.

#### *Adaptation, Integration, Ambivalence, and Comparisons with New Zealand*

RQ11. How do New Zealanders adapt to Australian society?

RQ12: In what ways do New Zealand migrants to Australia engage in comparisons of perceived gains and losses?

RQ13: How do New Zealand migrants to Australia express ambivalence about their decision to live in Australia?

Given the similarities between Australian and New Zealand society one would expect it would be relatively easy for New Zealand migrants to adapt to Australian society. Indeed, while 80% of survey respondents reported the move to Australia seemed like moving to another country rather than moving to another part of New Zealand, interviewees reporting few difficulties adapting to their adopted homeland. While a minority acknowledged that references to events in history, prominent Australians, or workplace regulations were sometimes puzzling, most interviewees had adapted easily to Australian society. However, some of the Maori interviewees recognised they had adapted to a situation where Maori culture was not significant in the mainstream society and where, for example, their requests that Maori cultural groups be supported by local authorities and councils went unheeded.

While some studies have found that migrants who moved when they were young people adapted and integrated more easily than older migrants (Liebkind, 1996), no statistically significant difference between younger and older migrants was found. In the current study migrants of all ages were satisfied with life in Australia suggesting they integrated effectively into Australian society, which can be attributed partly to the close similarity between the two cultures, partly to a perceived lack of racial tension, and to New Zealanders appreciation of Australian's "laid back" and "tolerant" behaviour and the Australian sense of humour.

However migration, even between similar countries, can cause culture shock amongst reluctant migrants (those who accompanied family or partner) as evident in the case of one recent arrival who had only moved to accompany her spouse who spoke of a feeling of dislocation, the second stage of culture shock (Oberg, 1960).

I find everything different ... it's not worse or bad ... just different ... the climate, I miss the rain ... the bush and the vegetation ... the birds are different ... the accent ... the supermarkets ... the different labelling and brands ... in many ways

everything's similar ... there are subtle differences but there's as many subtle similarities ... in general both countries are very similar but it's the detail that is different ... it seems simpler in New Zealand but that might be because that's what we're used to. (*Woman in early 40s, who had lived in Australia for six months*)

This degree of culture shock was uncommon, but almost all interviewees (27 of 31) engaged in some comparisons between Australia and New Zealand which is examined in relation to boundary maintenance later in this chapter.

For some migrants there was a conscious weighing up of the costs and benefits of life in both countries and accompanying re-assessment of where they wanted to live ("You weigh it up ... do I want Australia? Do I want New Zealand?"). This supports previous research findings that migrants make a series of trade-offs or "dialectical exchanges between perceived gains and losses" between their country of origin and their new home (Rogler, 1994, p. 704). This is an example of the ambivalence felt by some New Zealanders in Australia and accounts for the return to New Zealand of some. Close connection with family was an important factor for returning migrants. Declining health of aging parents, and the desire to start a family and bring them up with close contact with grandparents and other family members was enough to have some return home despite the many positive factors they perceived were provided by life in Australia. However, some migrants with children or grandchildren born in Australia chose to stay despite a sense of regret about leaving behind their New Zealand roots, because returning permanently to New Zealand would involve leaving Australian branches of their families.

The migrant experience creates some ambivalence involving a simultaneous desire for certainty and uncertainty which Baxter and Montgomery (1996) see as operating in many interpersonal and intrapersonal relationship communication situations. New Zealanders moving to Australia were satisfying their desire for new horizons (novelty) without placing themselves too far out of their comfort zone (predictability) ("you're not in a totally foreign land where you don't know ... what's going to happen"). The tension between predictability and novelty was evident in the choice of Australia as a destination.

Australia represented a safe challenge as the lifestyle and culture was as similar as it could possibly be to the one left behind. Thus, as discussed in relation to Research Question 10 above, while 34% of survey respondents indicated they moved to Australia out of a “sense of adventure”, New Zealand migrants to Australia could be categorised as cautious risk takers in that they can easily return to New Zealand if their expectations of life in Australia are not met. More adventurous New Zealanders, especially young adults could satisfy their desire for adventure by moving further afield to countries less like their country of origin.

Migrants motivated to move to Australia to seek greater financial security and/or out of dissatisfaction with social problems in New Zealand, were particularly expected to experience some ambivalence about their decision to move to Australia (Lee, 1966; Tartakovsky & Schwartz, 2001). However as discussed above, survey respondents who moved out of dissatisfaction with aspects of life in New Zealand were just as satisfied with life in Australia as those who expressed no dissatisfaction. Those who migrated to seek greater financial security (“better future for self and/or children”) also expressed comparable satisfaction levels to other respondents. Thus migrants were satisfied whether they moved for family reasons or to seek greater financial security.

One difficulty for those involved in population projections is that people do not always move for predictable or measurable reasons. Emotions and fantasies about somewhere else play their part (Lee, 1966). When migrants return to New Zealand the decision seems to depend on personal and family situations, such as the desire to live close to elderly parents and for children to live near family members, rather than dissatisfaction with Australia or enumerations of the attractions of New Zealand. Clearly job and financial opportunities attract many New Zealanders to Australia, and New Zealand government campaigns designed to attract the return of skilled migrants by emphasising New Zealand’s buoyant economy and the availability of jobs (Collins, 2005, March 12; Cunliffe, 2006; K. Taylor, 2005, November 2) are targeting factors which do not appear to feature in decisions regarding return migration.

However, while they expressed a high level of satisfaction with life in Australia, interviewees remained positive about New Zealand and had not ruled out the possibility, however remote, of returning to live in New Zealand at some point in the future. Indeed some interviewees who expressed enthusiasm for life in Australia subsequently moved back to New Zealand or said they were considering moving back.

Interviewees were open to the possibility of returning to New Zealand, but when survey respondents were asked the more specific question “how likely are you to return to New Zealand to live in the future?” only 10% of gave the highest ranking on a five-point scale, while a further 17% gave the second or third highest ranking. Interviewees who subsequently returned or considered returning appeared to make the decision, often quite quickly, because of a change in family circumstances such as concerns about the health of a family member in New Zealand. Motivations for return is an area worthy of further study.

In contrast to the prevailing affection for New Zealand among migrants, one interviewee reported that visits back to the area he grew up in made him realise that he had reached the point of no return, and now felt more at home in Australia.

I have no emotional attachment to New Zealand ... going back ... I think “Did I live there?” ... things that you remember ... they have completely done away with ... I have more attachment to Brisbane ... I’ve no one left in the North Island ... don’t know where I’d go ... and my children were born here. (*Man who moved to Australia nine years previously when he was in his mid-20s*)

This is similar to the feeling of “strangeness” experienced by Greek migrants to Canada on return visits to Greece when they realised the concepts of “home” they had treasured now existed only in their memories as substantial changes had occurred in their country of origin, which in turn led them to realise they had become acculturated in their adopted country (Polyzoi, 1985).

While migrants from New Zealand can hold both Australian and New Zealand citizenship simultaneously, most New Zealanders do not avail themselves of the opportunity. The rate of adoption of Australian citizenship among survey respondents (34%), similar to that reported in the 2001 Australian census (36.5%) (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2003), is a further indication of the ambivalence New Zealand migrants feel about committing themselves to life in Australia. Many New Zealanders living in Australia have divided loyalties. While they enjoy living in Australia, they still have emotional ties with New Zealand, and 20% of those who had not become Australian citizens cited allegiance to New Zealand as their reason for not taking that step. As New Zealanders do not have to give up their New Zealand citizenship, taking out Australian citizenship is a symbolic action that the majority of New Zealanders living in Australia do not choose to take. This was particularly true of Maori who spoke of the importance of remaining loyal to New Zealand and becoming an Australian citizen being seen as “a betrayal” spoken about in “whispered confessions in the kitchen”.

#### *Migration to be Reunited with Family*

RQ14: Will Maori migrants to Australia be more likely than *Pakeha* to be secondary migrants (those who migrated to be reunited with family)?

H4: Maori migrants will be more likely than *Pakeha* to be secondary migrants (those who migrated to be reunited with family).

Family ties were important for many New Zealanders. Fifty percent of all New Zealand migrants already had family living in Australia, however, only 30% listed the presence of family as a reason for the move. The difference between Maori and *Pakeha* was not statistically significant even though a slightly higher percentage of Maori survey respondents already had family members in Australia when they moved there; 60% compared with 48% for *Pakeha* respondents, and 76% had encouraged other family members to move there, compared with 49% of *Pakeha* respondents.

As Maori did not differ significantly from other New Zealanders in the proportion that moved to Australia to be reunited with family members already living there, this suggests

that Maori migrants to Australia were likely to be as work and achievement oriented as other New Zealand migrants. Maori who migrate to Australia may be less “traditional” than those who remained behind as Maori traditionally placed a high value on kinship ties (H. Mead, 2003; Patterson, 1992; R. Walker, 1989). This is an area worthy of further study.

### *Summary of the Migration Experience Considerations*

While supporting a commonly held view that New Zealanders’ migrate to Australia because it provides more job opportunities, a higher standard of living, and a warmer climate, at the same time this study demonstrates more complex motivations for moving to and remaining in Australia. Participants in this study had a wide range of reasons for migrating to Australia. Many included job and economic benefits among these reasons, while others were motivated by non-economic factors. Some moved out of a desire for a change, to get “out of a rut”, or to escape pressure, while others moved because of “conservative” views which led them to consider bicultural issues dominated New Zealand society to an unacceptable extent, and others moved in order to become anonymous or blend into society in a way they were unable to do in New Zealand.

It was also evident in the way interviewees talked about their migration experience that, as time passed, their original reasons for making the move to Australia were embellished by other factors by which they justified their decision to stay. Sustaining and justifying factors included better weather, freedom from racial tension, and the perception that Australians were less judgmental, and more direct and honest in their communication style. Intangible factors such as the freedom to live in what was perceived as a more relaxed and tolerant society and the freedom from negative stereotypes had a liberating effect which contributed to positive feelings about life in Australia and the perception that they could make more of their lives than had been possible in New Zealand.

Migrants were in the enviable position of not having to choose between two countries. They freely chose to live in Australia and were equally free to move back to New Zealand if they so desired. While migrants were more likely to be dissatisfied with New

Zealand than stayers, migrants were not forced from their homeland. They moved to Australia because they found it attractive and perceived it to have opportunities not available in New Zealand. The combination of strong pull and few push factors accounts for the ambivalence experienced by many New Zealanders living in Australia and for a sizable return rate (Bedford, 2001; Bedford et al., 2003; Lidgard & Gilson, 2002). Never having lost their New Zealand identity they found it relatively easy to take it up again, especially for life-stage or family support reasons.

As other studies have indicated (Ryan, 2004), migration is more complex than suggested by the push-pull model. Findings from the current study suggest that the push-pull model (Lee, 1966) incompletely describes the motivations of those who migrate from one first world country to another and who are not necessarily either pushed or pulled, but instead, motivated to move for personal development reasons such as a desire for a change or the need for more adventure in their lives. These personal satisfaction factors are inadequately factored into the push-pull model.

While dissatisfaction with social and political policies in New Zealand was a motivating factor for one-third of interviewees and survey respondents, many who are unhappy with Government policies remain there and this becomes a campaign issue each election (see for example, Brash, 2004). This provides support for suggestions there may be differences in the personality characteristics of migrants and stayers, as some people who are dissatisfied pack up and move to another country, while others who may be equally dissatisfied may complain about the situation but do not seriously contemplate relocating to another country.

While New Zealanders are free to move to Australia and to remain there indefinitely, they are now somewhat constricted by new regulations which came into effect in 2001. Changes to the eligibility criteria, to bring them into line with criteria for migrants from other countries, mean less skilled New Zealanders and those over 45 no longer qualify for Permanent Residency status, which affords social security privileges, tertiary education loans, the right to work for the government, and the right to gain citizenship. While



participants in this study included New Zealanders who had moved to Australia after these legislative changes to Australian immigration policies, the impact of the changes was not fully apparent. Some survey respondents lacked understanding of the new criteria as they indicated they intended to become citizens in the future when it was evident from their age on arrival that they were not eligible to do so (only three percent of those who had not become Australian citizens indicated lack of eligibility was the reason). However, some respondents were aware of and concerned about these changes to the eligibility criteria and wrote lengthy comments about the unfairness of this situation and their uncertainty about their long term future in Australia because of their ineligibility for pensions.

Obtaining citizenship is a lengthy and expensive process. In 2006 applications for permanent residency cost \$1,990 plus the cost of a medical examination, and citizenship applications cost a further \$120 (Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, 2006b). For these reasons it is likely that the citizenship rate among New Zealanders living in Australia will decrease from the current rate of 36% as the full effect of the changes makes an impact. It is also possible that the development of a large group of New Zealanders in Australia with “indefinite temporary” status but no prospect of gaining permanent residency, will give these migrants a sense of uncertainty and lead to their eventual return to New Zealand.

As New Zealanders integrate readily into a culture with similar values, attitudes, and history, express high levels of satisfaction with their decision to relocate (nearly half, 48%, of survey respondents gave the highest response on a five-point scale while a further 25% the second highest response), and contribute positively to the Australian economy, this study’s self-reports from migrants suggest New Zealand migrants to Australia both contribute positively to, and benefit positively from, Australian society.

### Theme Three: Migrants' Identity in Australia

This section discusses and analyses the enhanced loyalty and greater appreciation of New Zealand culture felt by New Zealand migrants in Australia, the way New Zealander's identity adapts and changes when they live in Australia, and the effect of migration on the identity of Maori interviewees.

#### *Enhanced Loyalty and Greater Appreciation of New Zealand Culture*

RQ15: What do the migration narratives communicate about the identity of New Zealanders when they live in Australia?

RQ16: Will New Zealanders living in Australia see themselves as more patriotic with a stronger sense of national identity than when they lived in New Zealand?

In this study, New Zealand migrants in Australia retained their identity as New Zealanders and demonstrated an enhanced loyalty towards New Zealand often demonstrated symbolically, for example, by heightened support for the All Blacks, as suggested by optimal distinctiveness theory which predicts group identity is strongest when membership involves being part of a minority group (Brewer, 1991, 1999). Optimal distinctiveness theory also explains the reaffirmation of identity perceived to be under threat and the resurgence of "boundary maintenance" behaviour (Barth, 1969; Oliver, 2002) this sets in motion. Increased migration, mobility, and the ease of communication between countries has, paradoxically, led to a reaffirmation of local cultures (Cohen, 1982; Holton, 1998).

However, generalisations about New Zealand migrant retention and enhancement of New Zealand identity need to be tempered by an understanding of the effects of time spent in another culture upon one's cultural identity. At the same time as expressing an enhanced loyalty towards New Zealand, migrants exhibited a form of transnationalism where they felt at home in both countries (true for 48% of survey respondents who had lived in Australia for between 3 and 10 years). As time went by emotional attachment to Australia increased to the extent that survey participants who had lived in Australia for 11 or more

years were more likely to claim emotional attachment to Australia. New Zealand migrants to Australia tended to have an idealised image of New Zealand and, while demonstrating symbolic attachment through support for the All Blacks and other sporting teams, on balance, preferred to live in Australia.

In addition, while 82% said they would describe their national identity as New Zealanders when travelling to a country outside Australia or New Zealand, their national identity was dependent on the context as, in some circumstances they identified as Australian. For example, although 81% of survey respondents indicated they identified as New Zealanders during trans-Tasman sporting clashes, they identified as Australian and took pride in the success of Australian sportsmen and women when Australia competed against other countries. This supports the view that multiple group identities are held simultaneously (Brewer, 1999), and that the self, or face, the individual portrays depends, in part, on the other participants in the interaction (Ting-Toomey, 1988). Thus it can be seen that the identity of New Zealand migrants in Australia was complex and fluid, perhaps more so than that of New Zealanders who had remained in their country of origin.

In addition, participants' sense of what constituted New Zealand identity varied according to the region of New Zealand they came from, and their concept of Australian identity was confined to the parts of Australia they were familiar with. Some interviewees recognised their identities were localised, that they spoke not of Australia or New Zealand but of particular parts of each country, for example the Gold Coast or Dunedin. Thus, Cohen's prediction that local identities "mediate national identity" (Cohen, 1982, p. 13), and that what is referred to as transnationalism can be manifested as highly localised attachments, was apparent in the narratives of some interviewees. Thus, it seems more accurate to refer to transnationals as "bilocals" (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004) or to speak of "global translocalism" rather than transnationalism, as the latter term suggests unwarranted connotations of being at home in many different countries (Appaduri, in Kelly, 2003; Kivisto, 2001).

*Identity Adaptation and Change*

RQ17: What do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia suggest about how New Zealanders adapt and change when they live in Australia?

In general, the experience of living in Australia had been positive with migrants indicating positive changes to their identity as a result of the migration experience. Living in Australia had given interviewees a broader outlook on life in New Zealand; 51% of survey respondents considered they were more international in outlook since moving to Australia. Thus a migrants' identity is constantly being challenged, negotiated, co-created and reinforced (Brewer, 1999; Collier, 2000). Migrants adapted and changed as a result of communication with others, experiencing convergence with the new culture and divergence from their previous communication behaviour and identity (Abrams et al., 2003).

When commenting, for example, on Australians' direct, honest communication style, and relaxed and positive attitude to life interviewees demonstrated both convergence with what they perceived as a more appealing Australian identity and divergence from what they perceived as constraining expectations and communication styles in New Zealand ("Australians ... more laid back ... not so conservative ... more free spirits ... New Zealanders take themselves too seriously ... people in New Zealand ... say you're not the same ... I've become a free spirit"). These aspects of Australian identity are given little attention when Australians identify their unique characteristics, suggesting New Zealand migrants to Australia demonstrated the ethnographic view (Geertz, 1973) of strangers, identifying taken for granted Australian characteristics as a result of seeing Australian culture from the standpoint of an outsider.

In summary, migration to Australia enabled the interviewees to experience greater personal freedom, to discover their reserves of personal strength, and to express what they considered their true selves as a result of being away from situations where they felt they were expected to conform to the expectations of others.

### *Effect of Migration on Maori Identity*

RQ18: How do the roles, norms, and expectations of Maori New Zealanders change when they move to Australia?

RQ19: Are Maori migrants to Australia more aware of the differences between the identities of the two countries and do they experience more difficulty adapting to Australia than do *Pakeha* New Zealanders?

Participants in this study who self-identified as Maori expressed this identification in a number of different ways with the result that trends observed below are necessarily limited in their generalisability.

### *Enhanced Appreciation of Importance of Maori Culture*

For some Maori migrants, Maori culture had become more salient since they moved to Australia. Maori culture had been taken for granted when they were in every day contact with their culture as members of Maori families and communities in New Zealand, where they had been members of a relatively large minority; 15% of the population (Statistics New Zealand, 2006a). However, it was more important now they had become members of a much smaller minority in Australia. This enhanced appreciation of Maori culture is predicted by optimal distinctiveness theory which highlights how being a member of a minority affects an individual's sense of identity. Biases in favour of the in-group increase as the relative size of the in-group in comparison to the out-group decreases (Brewer, 1991, 1999).

### *Divergence from Racial Stereotypes*

For some Maori interviewees the move to Australia had been the catalyst for a re-examination of the way they were viewed in New Zealand. This had led them to conclude they had been limited by societal expectations (“at home you think you can’t do those things”), that, because they were Maori, they were expected to behave in certain ways and conform to certain roles, as predicted by structuration theory (Giddens, 1984) which suggests the dominant ethnic group in a society has expectations about the roles and behaviour of members of minority groups which limits the actions of members of the

minority and also become rules by which minority group members unconsciously lead their lives.

In contrast to the situation in New Zealand, in Australia Maori interviewees saw an absence of constraining roles, norms, and expectations which enabled them to experience greater personal freedom in ways that were not possible in New Zealand. As a result they had discovered their reserves of personal strength and were able to express what they considered their true self away from situations where they felt they were expected to conform to the expectations of others. This greater sense of freedom included freedom from the expectation to conform to the rules imposed by their tribal structures, as well as the expectations of the dominant majority.

As a result of these positive changes in their identity since moving to Australia these Maori migrants defined themselves as different to their Maori friends and family left behind in New Zealand, which boosted migrant's self-image and reinforced their decision to move to Australia. In summary, the label Maori had connotations in New Zealand that it did not have in Australia. According to symbolic interactionism which focuses on the power of labels on self-concept and behaviour, preconceived ideas can lead to self-fulfilling prophecies whereby an individual's expectations lead to the anticipated behaviour, as happened in this case. Thus the "generalised other" provides information about roles, rules and attitudes (G. H. Mead, 1934).

Comments from Maori interviewees demonstrated the interacting effects of both ascription; the process by which others attribute identities to an individual through stereotypes and avowal; what an individual presents of him or her self to others; similar to face or image shown to others (Collier, 2000; Ting-Toomey, 1988). This led Maori to have lower expectations in New Zealand and explains the subsequent liberating effect of living in Australia and being regarded as "just another person in society".

### *Convergence of Maori and Pakeha Identity in Australia*

In Australia as members of the same minority group with shared histories, understandings, values and beliefs, some Maori migrants felt closer to *Pakeha* than they had when living in New Zealand where they felt differences were emphasised. These Maori interviewees reported forming a new identity, that of a “Kiwi” resident in Australia, a situated identity, in which the previous dichotomy of Maori/*Pakeha* was not as strong. That they were now able to contemplate an identity shared with *Pakeha* New Zealanders demonstrated that travel had a bonding effect.

However, none of the *Pakeha* interviewees commented on feeling closer to Maori in Australia than they had in New Zealand, which provides another example of differing perspectives between the dominant and minority groups. From the standpoint of the dominant culture in New Zealand, *Pakeha* may have been unquestioning, or unaware of the mono-cultural nature of their social groupings. In Australia *Pakeha* were members of a relatively large minority, and therefore felt their minority status less keenly than the Maori interviewees.

### *Pan-tribal Maori Identity in Australia*

Maori active in their tribal communities in New Zealand had experienced greater cultural change than *Pakeha* New Zealanders when they moved to Australia. Migrants reconstructed not only their personal identities, but also their collective identities. Interviewees described “patching together a family” of other Maori from a range of tribes, from whom they would have differentiated themselves in New Zealand and not seen as “family”. After moving to Australia, the label “family” was less likely to be based on kinship ties than in New Zealand. Family, which in New Zealand was made up of blood relatives and members of the same tribe, had, in Australia, come to mean other Maori who were not necessarily connected through kinship ties. This contrasts with Metge’s study of Maori migration to Auckland in the 1950s where the strongest connections of most immigrants was based on kinship ties (Metge, 1964). Members of different tribes who, in New Zealand, emphasised their differences, enacted in different identifying

customs and protocols, as they competed for resources and attempted to keep their distinct identities, came together as Maori in Australia.

However, a pan-tribal Maori identity was not true of all Maori migrants. Members of well represented, larger tribes continued to socialise within tribal groups in Australia. In addition, some interviewees said they had not taken part in Maori cultural activities in Australia because these were not based on kinship groups interacting.

For Maori in Australia, the identity they chose to present to others depended on who they interacted with. They might identify themselves as New Zealanders when communicating with Australians, Maori when communicating with *Pakeha* living in Australia, and according to their tribal affiliation when in New Zealand or with Maori in Australia. This highlights the complexity of life as a minority migrant and the adaptability this requires.

#### *Identity Stereotypes Conferred by Australians*

While Maori migrants described the move to Australia as freeing them from the preconceptions held by other New Zealanders, 3 of the 15 self-identified Maori interviewees mentioned preconceptions of Maori held by Australians. As an example of the attribution of identity by others through the imposition of stereotypes (Abrams et al., 2003; Collier, 2000), Maori asserted they had been regarded by Australians as dole bludgers (unemployed and living on social security payments without making genuine attempts to find employment), and that the movie “*Once Were Warriors*” had led Australians to view Maori as violent, heavy drinkers, as cultivation theory suggests (Gerbner, 1998). Thus while Maori spoke positively about life in Australia, due in large part to a lack of stereotyping and negative expectations, they were not totally freed from the negative connotations of being Maori ascribed by others. On balance, however, they considered they were viewed less negatively in a more neutral way in Australia.

#### *Summary of Migrants’ Identity in Australia Considerations*

New Zealand identity is clearly important to those who migrate, suggesting national identity is a core element in personal identity which remains with individuals even if they



spend their adult life in another country. However, being a migrant develops complexities in one's identity, through a process of accommodating to competing values through the dialectics of communication; communicating their old identity and refining their new identity. New Zealand migrants to Australia negotiated the current form of their identity through a constant iterative process involving conceptions of who they were in their new country, who they were in their old country, who New Zealanders were in Australia and a crystallised view of New Zealand identity which came from their recall of their lives in New Zealand, albeit an idealised or romanticised view of New Zealand identity, and new awareness of previously taken for granted aspects of it. They adapted and changed at the same time as retaining and sustaining their identity as New Zealanders. They had a strengthened sense of identity and enhanced sense of New Zealand national identity whilst differentiating themselves from both those left behind, and Australians. Changes resulting from living in Australia led them to view New Zealand and New Zealanders in a different light. These changes were particularly evident in Maori interviewees who demonstrated adaptability and flexibility, just as they did in previous times of change (Metge, 1964), as they negotiated the complexities of their new identities. Despite the changes engendered by their decision to live in Australia, and their satisfaction with their life in their new country, New Zealand migrants generally asserted an enduring allegiance to New Zealand.

New Zealanders, Maori and *Pakeha* alike, effectively integrate into Australian society, simultaneously maintaining their New Zealand and/or Maori status at the same time as identifying with Australian society thus, according to acculturation theories (Berry, 2001), demonstrating a high level of success in their host country.

#### Theme Four: Boundary Maintenance

In part, migrant identity is derived from comparisons which New Zealanders made between themselves as a group and Australians. This section compares the boundary maintenance behaviour of migrants and stayers, the boundary spanning activities of the

two groups, and the ways New Zealand migrants in Australia used symbols of New Zealand identity to maintain the boundaries with Australia.

*Comparison of the Boundaries Maintained by Migrants and Stayers*

RQ20: What do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia suggest about how New Zealanders maintain the boundaries of their national identity when living in a similar culture?

RQ21: How do these narratives compare with the way New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand maintain the boundaries of their national identity with Australia?

Both migrants and stayers actively maintained the boundaries between New Zealand and Australian culture by engaging in comparisons, in which New Zealand generally emerged as superior in most respects. However, while there was considerable overlap between the views of the two groups, stayers asserted their superiority over Australians more strongly than migrants.

Interviewees on both sides of the Tasman considered New Zealand was a better place to raise a family, had less corruption, than New Zealanders were better workers, and Australia was seen as “too American”. In addition, both migrants and stayers claimed the moral high ground with regards to race relations.

However, some migrants expressed considerable dissatisfaction about race relations in New Zealand. These respondents saw Australia as a better place with regards to racial tension, or considered Australia afforded Maori freedom from racial stereotypes. Many migrants claimed that Australians had a better communication style than New Zealanders. In contrast, stayers claimed New Zealander’s communication style was superior to Australians. Although some stayers did see Australians as upfront and positive, they made fewer assertions about Australia being superior.

*Areas of Agreement between Migrants and Stayers*

New Zealanders on both sides of the Tasman used the greater influence of American culture on Australian culture to claim the moral high ground, believing New Zealand had a more distinctive and unique identity in comparison to Australia which they considered had “sold out” to the American super-power. In a form of symbolic interactionism (G. H. Mead, 1934), New Zealanders assigned negative meanings to the activities of the United States and positive meanings to New Zealand’s nuclear free policies, viewing New Zealand as more principled than either Australia or the United States. Participants in this study took pride in their view that, unlike Australia, of New Zealand stood up to the United States. This principled stance against a superpower formed part of the positive view they had of their homeland.

Interviewees in this study also expressed a sense of pride and superiority over Australians by claiming that New Zealanders had a better work ethic. Along with the view New Zealand leads the world in race relations, New Zealanders work ethic is one of the “myths” of New Zealand forged out of stories from the country’s pioneering past (Sinclair, 1986). Participants in this study had internalised both of these assertions of New Zealand superiority and used them to bolster their self-image in relation to Australia. In addition, New Zealand business activities were considered to be less corrupt than in Australia. In asserting New Zealanders were better workers and less corrupt, interviewees were again claiming moral superiority over Australians.

New Zealand was also seen as a good place to “nest” by both migrants and stayers for three reasons; the desirability of raising children in close proximity to family members in New Zealand; the perception that New Zealand was safer as there was less pressure from corrupting influences such as the availability of drugs, and the view that New Zealand’s physical environment was more desirable. However, there was incongruence between the behaviour and the espoused beliefs of migrants who held this somewhat nostalgic view, as they were themselves choosing to spend their early adulthood in Australia. In addition, as noted in chapter 7, many people with young children said that they had migrated to Australia to give their children a better life.

*Differences in Migrants and Stayers Boundary Maintenance Behaviour*

While seemingly aware of their culture when living in New Zealand, New Zealand migrants in Australia viewed some aspects of their culture in a new light after moving to Australia. For example, migrants found the Australian communication style refreshingly direct which led them to reappraise their opinion of New Zealanders' communication style. This viewpoint was shared by some returnees, while those who had stayed in New Zealand and were less likely to have experienced the Australian communication style for extended periods, considered New Zealanders' communication style was superior. This suggests migrants and returnees had altered their views on this aspect of New Zealand culture through the social construction of meaning (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Gergen, 1985; Pearce, 1994, 1995) developed as a result of day-to-day communication with Australians.

Of the two groups, stayers had a more congruent viewpoint; seeing their New Zealand culture as superior, and not mentioning negative aspects of New Zealand identity to the same extent as the migrant group. As predicted by social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) which explains the tendency of individuals to have a more favourable impression of the groups they belong to as a means of establishing and maintaining positive self-esteem, lack of day-to-day contact with Australians probably contributed to stayers exaggeration of the differences between the two groups with the effect of stereotyping Australians as "loud" and "brash".

Optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991, 1999) which predicts that loyalty is strongest for members of minority groups, and therefore suggests New Zealand migrants to Australia and not stayers would have more positive views of New Zealand, was not supported by this study. Explanations for the loyalty of stayers can be found in the behaviour of members of "peripheral" communities (Cohen, 1999b, 1982), and in cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) which suggests that people emphasise reasons to justify their actions, in this case staying in New Zealand while other family members or friends had gone to Australia.

Cohen asserted that communities operating at the edges of larger societies, and which see their existence as under threat, exhibit a fierce desire to maintain their distinctive identity, so that for these communities the boundary between themselves and others is fundamental to their identity. For groups on the periphery, both their national image, and self-image is bolstered by viewing their culture as superior to more central societies (Cohen, 1999a, 1999b). Peripherality implies that identity cannot be taken for granted as it is constantly under threat of being subsumed into the identities of larger societies (Cohen, 1999a, 1999b). This provides an explanation for New Zealanders' defensive reaction to the political and media influence of the United States and accounts for New Zealanders' refusal to contemplate uniting with Australia despite the benefits such a union would have for a small isolated country. Rather than being absorbed by a larger neighbour New Zealand stayers, like many peripheral communities (in Cohen's terms), vehemently asserted their differences from Australia and their loyalty to a distinctive (to them) New Zealand.

Cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) also provides an explanation for the more positive view of New Zealand exhibited by stayers, as New Zealanders experienced "dissonance" when family members moved from the "paradise" of "home" to Australia. Stayers therefore, had to justify their own decision to stay in New Zealand which they did by highlighting its positive aspects and ignoring or downplaying its negative aspects. Similarly, migrants were seen to reduce dissonance about regrets regarding what they had left behind by emphasising Australia's advantages.

In contrast to the more congruent stayers' views, migrants who were simultaneously "insiders" and "outsiders" in both societies, were more likely to see New Zealand as superior in some respects, and Australia as superior in other respects, thus supporting Deaux' critique of social identity theory and assertion that social comparisons were multi-dimensional (2000).

When stayers mentioned the influence of Maori on New Zealand culture it was seen as a positive feature contrasting with the ambivalence towards the effect of Maori culture expressed by New Zealand migrants to Australia. New Zealand's superior race relations record is one of the "myths" (King, 2003) of New Zealand identity which the stayers in this study have internalised, and is yet another example of insiders' tendency to see their culture as superior to other cultures as predicted by social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The absence of negative comments by *Paheka* stayers about the position of Maori in New Zealand can be partially explained by the stated aim of the interview with stayers which was to discuss stayers' views on why a family member had moved to Australia and their views of Australia, Australians, and Australian and New Zealand culture.

Migrants mentioned trans-Tasman rivalry more frequently than stayers which suggests the salience of this issue was greater for the migrant group who were in constant contact with Australians. On the other hand, stayers, who were less likely to engage with Australians on a regular basis, did not volunteer it as a feature of the trans-Tasman relationship. Thus even the boundary maintenance activity of trans-Tasman rivalry showed evidence of social construction of reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966).

Comment about the relative importance and impact of Roman Catholicism on Australia and New Zealand is an example of one of the more subtle differences between Australia and New Zealand which, nevertheless, has an effect on the attitudes, behaviours, and values of its people. The dour influence of New Zealand's Scottish heritage, especially in the south of the South Island of New Zealand has been noted by some commentators (McLauchlan, 1976). In Australia, on the other hand, due to early Irish migration and later Southern European migration, Catholicism is the largest religious group; 27% of the population claim adherence to the Catholic faith (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2003a), compared with 14% in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2002b), which is a difference not often commented upon by those making comparisons between Australia and New Zealand, but mentioned by some interviewees.

Another difference between New Zealand and Australia is that New Zealand has embraced biculturalism, and has made serious efforts to include Maori culture in mainstream activities. Thus, some Maori migrants to Australia found they needed to adjust and accept that official bodies such as local authorities are unwilling to fund Maori cultural activities in Australia, and both migrants and stayers expressed criticism of Australia because, in their view, it had not sufficiently recognised the rights of its Aboriginal citizens.

Despite the acknowledged similarities between the two countries interviewees considered that differences were significant, with 80% of surveyed migrants saying that moving to Australia seemed like moving to a different country, recognising that there were distinct differences between moving to Australia and moving to a different part of New Zealand. While several stayers voiced the unsought opinion New Zealand would never unite with Australia, none of the migrant interviewees mentioned unification with Australia which suggested stayers had been influenced by media discussion of the matter in New Zealand as predicted by agenda setting theory (McCombs, 2004; McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Resistance to uniting with Australia is an example of both a smaller society looking at a bigger society fearing they will be swallowed up by it, and the wariness over perceived threats to identity experienced by “peripheral” societies (Cohen, 1999b, 1982).

### *Boundary Spanning*

RQ22: To what extent do the migration narratives of New Zealanders living in Australia and interview data from New Zealanders who have stayed in or returned to New Zealand present New Zealand and Australian identity as similar?

Although boundaries were strongly maintained and differences asserted there was also evidence of boundary spanning between these two populations. Dominating was a sense of connection which distinguishes the Australia/New Zealand boundary from what Oliver (2001; 2002) reported of Scottish/English boundary defining. The ANZAC tradition was referred to by older migrant interviewees as a bonding factor. Other interviewees commented there was very little difference between the two countries. The multi-

dimensional nature of comparisons between New Zealand and Australian identity indicates that the designation of in-groups and out-groups was quite complex, which again supports Deaux' (2000) view that social comparison processes are multi-faceted, with members of social groups seeing themselves as superior to other groups in some, but not all respects.

One difference between migrants and stayers was that the latter's accounts of New Zealand identity did not mention the ANZAC tradition. This may have been because they were focusing on differences between the two countries, or, alternatively, because in New Zealand the ANZAC tradition has become less important with the passage of time, as suggested by Allan Hawke when he was appointed Australian High Commissioner to New Zealand in 2003 (Harvey, 2003). However, young New Zealanders attend yearly commemorative celebrations at Gallipoli in similar numbers to Australians, demonstrating that when overseas they shared with Australians a renewed interest in the ANZACS.

### *Symbols of New Zealand Identity*

RQ23: In what ways do New Zealanders living in Australia evoke symbols of New Zealand identity and what is their function?

The most notable symbols of New Zealand identity evoked by New Zealanders living in Australia were references to the All Blacks and to aspects of Maori language and culture. These symbolic markers provided a means for New Zealanders to communicate that they considered New Zealand culture was distinct from Australian culture. As predicted by social constructionism, New Zealanders living in Australia used these symbols to generate a sense of shared belonging (Cohen, 1982), and to reinforce the distinctiveness of New Zealand's history and traditions (Shweder, 1991). These symbols served to unite the members of the New Zealand community in Australia and to symbolize the New Zealand community to its members and to outsiders (Jenkins, 1996).



*Summary of Boundary Maintenance Considerations*

Migrants did not replace their New Zealand identity with an Australian identity. However, over time this identity was overlaid with a more transnational identity which is discussed in the next section of this chapter. New Zealand migrants in Australia were positive about New Zealand culture but regretful or somewhat ambivalent about some aspects, as indicated by one interviewee who said; “it’s a neat country but it has lost direction”.

Assertions of cultural values are boundary maintenance activities, allowing individuals to separate and differentiate themselves from members of other cultures. Thus, their New Zealand cultural identity served participants in this study as a boundary to their identity with Australians. Overlap between participants’ cultural identity and boundary maintenance behaviour was evident with aspects of New Zealand identity, such as the integration of Maori culture, and New Zealanders being good workers, also being used to assert that New Zealand was superior to Australia, and thus establish a boundary between the two cultures.

New Zealand migrants to Australia were both insiders and outsiders simultaneously, which supports the view it is a “boundary condition of peripheral societies that their gaze is simultaneously outward and introspective” (Cohen, 1999a, p. 12). New Zealanders living in Australia communicated a sense of distinctiveness from Australians and vigorously engaged in boundary maintenance activity. In reflecting on the impact of migration on their identity they also attributed a positive or negative value to these differences. Depending on the nature of the judgment the characteristic was “either strengthened and sustained, or ... deserted” (Cohen, 1982, p. 5). Identity is dynamic and constantly being reconstructed (Brewer, 1999; Oliver, 2001). As evidenced by the migrant group, the boundary of similarity and difference was not fixed but continually negotiated, reinforced or reappraised (Oliver, 2001) enriching and deepening cultural understanding in the process.

Participants in this study vigorously maintained the boundary between New Zealand and Australian culture by asserting that New Zealand was superior, thus bolstering a positive

self-image as predicted by social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). At the same time, migrants were positive about life in Australia and pointed out the benefits of their decision to live in Australia. Migrants were more aware of defining aspects of their culture and points of difference between New Zealand and Australian culture now they were living in Australia however, stayers were also conscious of the components of New Zealand culture in the same way the Scots in Oliver's (2001) study affirmed differences between Scottish and British culture.

#### Theme Five: Transnationalism

This section discusses the extent to which the migration narratives and survey responses of New Zealanders living in Australia suggested these migrants had a transnational identity, and what this implies for trans-Tasman migration policies and practice.

##### *Maintenance of Links with New Zealand*

RQ24: In what ways will New Zealand migrants to Australia maintain social, emotional, economic, and political links with New Zealand?

RQ25: Will migrants attachment to, and contact with New Zealand decrease over time?

H6: Migrants who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years will be more attached to, and maintain more contact with, New Zealand than those who had lived there for 11 or more years.

Transnationals are immigrants who build, maintain and reinforce multiple and constant economic, social and emotional interconnections with more than one country (Vertovec, 2001; Waters, 2003), whose personal and working lives involve "multiple & constant interconnections across international borders" (Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995, p. 48), and who "remain intensely involved in the life of their country of origin" (Gold, 1997, para. 6). In this study the majority of New Zealanders living in Australia had multiple connections with New Zealand. Interviewees displayed varying degrees of a transnational identity, as measured by reports of emotional and social links with New Zealand, and

constant interconnections with both countries. Socio-cultural transnationalism was strong but economic and political transnationalism (Portes et al., 1999) was less evident. While some maintained economic ties, few talked about political ties with New Zealand. Data relating to the maintenance of social, emotional, economic, and political links with New Zealand; migrants' expanded perception of "home" to include both countries; and networks of New Zealanders migrating, are discussed, analysed, and interpreted below.

### *Social and Emotional Ties*

While conscious of the benefits of Australian life, migrants' strong attachment to their New Zealand identity and emotional ties with family in New Zealand was evident in interviewees' comments. When family networks straddled the Tasman, interviewees regretted lack of regular contact with extended family members, particularly those sick and aging. Some interviewees also expressed strong attachment to particular specific locations ("if I haven't been home for some time I feel the need to go back [to tribal land]").

Survey results supported interview trends. Respondents displayed continued attachment to New Zealand by indicating they still identified as New Zealanders rather than Australians (82% of survey respondents), by supporting New Zealand sporting teams when they played Australia (81%), by having continued emotional attachment to New Zealand (66%), and continuing friendships with New Zealanders (76% indicated most of their closest friends were either from New Zealand or both Australia and New Zealand compared with 18% who said most of their friends were from Australia) (see Tables 7.4-7.7).

### *Constant contact.*

Research participants retained a strong sense of connection with New Zealand. Relative closeness between the two countries, cheap airfares, the ease of communication via telephone and new technologies, coupled with contact with other New Zealanders in Australia meant that migrants were in constant contact with New Zealand family, friends and events. Both interview participants and survey respondents went backwards and

forwards across the Tasman (82% of migrant survey respondents had been back at least once in the last three years), and had frequent visitors from New Zealand (89% had had visitors from New Zealand to stay on at least one occasion in the last three years, with 65% hosting visitors on three or more occasions - see Table 7.8). In addition, many survey respondents were in frequent phone and email contact with New Zealand (58% phoned New Zealand at least fortnightly while 52% emailed at least fortnightly - see Table 7.9). Frequent contact with New Zealanders in both countries meant that migrants kept up-to-date with political and social events there.

Because transnationalism assumes migrants and their families left behind have the financial means to travel and access to new technology, it is sometimes argued that the concept of transnationalism does not describe the situation of poorer migrants (Ghosh & Wang, 2003). However, it is still applicable to New Zealanders as the introduction of Freedom Air, a “no-frills” subsidiary of Air New Zealand in 1995, led to cheaper air fares between the two countries making a trip across the Tasman affordable even to those on lower incomes.

*Connections maintained by Maori.*

Emotional ties were particularly strong for Maori participants. When asked if their heart (emotional attachment) was mostly in Australia or New Zealand, 86% of Maori survey respondents indicated their heart was mostly in New Zealand, compared with 66% of all respondents. The pull of family still in New Zealand and connections to tribal land was particularly strong with older Maori interviewees expressing a desire to continue the ritual of being buried on their own tribal land. This demonstrates a commitment to retaining an important ritual, which has endured through many changes since the European settlement of New Zealand despite physical relocation to Australia. Thus even though they lived in Australia, Maori migrants retained a very strong affinity with New Zealand, in keeping with the spiritual and symbolic importance of the land to Maori.

*Effect of length of time in Australia.*

As expected, attachment to, and contact with, New Zealand was greater for recent arrivals than for New Zealanders who had lived in Australia for many years. For the latter group there was a statistically significant decline in support for New Zealand sporting teams when they played Australia (see Table 7.5), identifying as a New Zealander when travelling overseas (see Table 7.7), “emotional attachment” to New Zealand (see Table 7.6), and frequency of phone and email contact with New Zealand (see Table 7.9). There was also a reduction in the number of migrants who had visitors from New Zealand to stay.

These data supports the view that transnationalism is a transitional state which is part of the settlement process (Kelly, 2003). However, some ties, such as continued loyalty for sporting teams, endured for many years, albeit to a lesser extent, as has been observed with migrants to other countries (Banks, 1996 & Werbner, 1996 in Bergin, 2002). Interestingly, the results of the current study indicate stronger connections for the 3-10 years group rather than those who had lived in Australia for less time, regarding support for New Zealand sporting teams, emotional attachment to New Zealand, email contact with New Zealand, and visitors from New Zealand. This increase in expressions of loyalty and regular contact with New Zealand suggests enhanced loyalty after a “honeymoon phase” (Oberg, 1960) of enjoying the novelty of being “Australian”. This groups’ hosting a higher number of visitors than those who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years could also be explained by this group having settled in to life in Australia, and being in stable living situations where they were in a position to offer hospitality. Migrants’ friends and family members, for their part, would have had time to plan and save the fare for a visit to Australia. At this stage migrants and stayers would still be in close contact. However, contact diminished over time. The lower proportion of visitors for those in the 0-2 year group would have been due, in part, to some members of this group being very recent arrivals.

### *Economic Ties*

Transnationalism has been related to migrants with business interests in both their country of origin and country of settlement and “astronaut” family situations where the father returns to the country of origin leaving the wife and children in their adopted country (Waters, 2003). Indeed, some writers have asserted that economic interests in both countries are one of the hallmarks of transnationals (Portes et al., 1999). While there has been anecdotal evidence of New Zealand families in this situation in Australia, such as a family featured on a current affairs program in New Zealand during 2005, where the father “lived” and worked from a motor home on the Kapiti Coast while his wife and children lived in an apartment in Surfers Paradise, none of the migrant interviewees were in this situation, and few of the current study’s participants maintained economic ties with New Zealand. Only two of the 31 interviewees and 16% of survey respondents reporting maintenance of economic ties with New Zealand through income sources from both Australia and New Zealand (a further 2% of the survey respondents’ income was exclusively from New Zealand).

Economic transnationalism has been reported most frequently among those who had very high incomes, typically owning their own businesses, and among those from low income backgrounds. For the latter group this has been associated with the sending of remittances to family left behind in poorer countries (Levitt, 2001). Remittances are not customary amongst Maori and no participants mentioned sending money home. However, one Maori interviewee married to a Cook Islander mentioned freedom from the monetary dependence of relatives as a positive aspect of moving to Australia.

### *Political Ties*

Maintenance of political ties has also been reported as part of transnational identity especially in relation to the role played in the political struggles of less developed countries by those who have “escaped” their country of origin (Glick-Schiller & Basch, 1995). Some Maori remained involved in the ongoing political struggles of their *iwi* (tribe). However, there was no mention of ongoing political connections with New Zealand among *Pakeha* interviewees. Maori who did speak of *iwi* politics were

ambivalent about their continued engagement, expressing a sense of freedom from the divisive nature of ongoing attempts to obtain financial settlements from the New Zealand government which led to competition and bad feeling between members of different tribes, and between Maori and *Pakeha* New Zealanders.

Maori who lived in Australia were targeted by New Zealand political groups in the lead up to the 2005 general election. Campaigning was carried out in Australia by the Maori Party (New Zealand Herald, 2005, April 11), and the newly founded Destiny New Zealand Party, contesting the Maori seats<sup>23</sup>, whose leaders spoke at the Waitangi Day celebration on the Gold Coast in February 2004. In contrast, a Factiva search of Australian and New Zealand newspapers found no reports of parties campaigning for the votes of those on the general electoral roll in the lead up to the election.

#### *Attachment to Both Countries*

RQ26: Will length of time in Australia increase the proportion of New Zealand migrants who regard both Australia and New Zealand as home?

H7: Migrants who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years will be more likely to have expanded their perception of “home” to include both Australia and New Zealand than those who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years.

Transnationals have been said to expand their perception of home to encompass “both here and there” (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004, p. 1180) experiencing attachment to two countries simultaneously (Gold, 1997). This was true for some participants. For example, some interviewees indicated their ideal situation would be to live in both countries, while others considered the two countries were so similar it was difficult to tell them apart. This suggests a merging and morphing of identity and sense of place. This expanded perception of home to encompass both Australia and New Zealand was also evident when interviewees’ asserted they had taken on some aspects of Australian identity and were more international in outlook since moving to Australia. Survey results also lent support

---

<sup>23</sup> Maori choose whether to be on the Maori or General electoral roll and the number of Maori seats (seven seats in 2006) in parliament is determined by the number of Maori on the Maori roll. Campaigning by Maori parties therefore includes encouraging Maori to put their names on the Maori roll.

to an expanded perception of home to include both countries, as nearly half the survey respondents (42%) indicated they saw themselves belonging in both countries, while there were almost equal numbers who said they belonged in Australia (30%) and New Zealand (28%) (see Table 7.10).

Whether or not migrants expand their perception of home to encompass both countries is influenced by factors such as length of time in Australia and ethnicity. The survey data showed that, for some migrants, after being resident in Australia for more than 10 years a transnational identity was replaced by a closer connection with Australia. Respondents who had been in Australia less than two years were more likely to see themselves as belonging in New Zealand (16.2 raw score values higher than expected); those who had lived in Australia for 3-10 years were more likely to see themselves as belonging in both countries (7.8 raw score values higher than expected); while those who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years were more likely to see themselves as belonging in Australia (13.7 raw score values higher than expected). Thus social and cultural transnationalism appears strongest for New Zealanders who have been in Australia for between three and 10 years.

While some studies have referred to transnational ties enduring to a second generation (for example, Kelly, 2003; Portes, 1997; Vertovec, 2001), the results of this study have shown a diminishing sense of connection with New Zealand the longer the migrant had lived in Australia. That said however, interview transcripts did reveal one example of ties extending to a second generation. In summary, this study's results support the view that transnationalism was a transient state which was part of the settlement process (Kelly, 2003) and which would not endure across generations. This gradual transfer of sense of home from New Zealand, to both countries, to Australia, supports the view that transnationalism and assimilation are intertwined social processes (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004).

However, ties with New Zealand were more enduring for Maori. The proportion of Maori survey respondents who indicated they saw themselves as belonging in New Zealand was



higher, at 56%, than overall (28%), while the proportion who saw themselves belonging in both countries or Australia was lower at 32% (compared with 42% overall), and 12% (compared with 30% overall) respectively (see p. 163). This suggests that while a high proportion of *Pakeha* New Zealanders felt they belonged in Australia, for migrants of Maori ethnicity belonging and consequently identity is closely linked with New Zealand.

Maori participants encouraged family members to join them in Australia in greater proportions than New Zealanders in general, and remained involved in tribal and political activities. These linkages were two-way as Maori organisations in New Zealand, such as the Maori Affairs Department, (Te Puni Kokiri), Maori political parties, and tribal bodies, make more effort to maintain the channels of communication and retain connections with Maori living in Australia, including the second generation. In contrast, no similar efforts are made by New Zealand authorities to retain connections with other New Zealanders in Australia.

### *Networks Migrate*

RQ27: Will networks of New Zealanders migrate to Australia?

Transnationalists consider migration should be studied from the perspective of networks, rather than individuals or households, because “networks migrate” (Vertovec, 2003). These networks include family members and members of the migrants’ friendship networks in their country of origin. The migration of family networks and the maintenance of friendship groups with New Zealanders were evident in this study. Many interview participants cited family in Australia as a motivating force for moving there (18 of the 31 interviewees volunteered this as a factor) and encouraged other family members to move to Australia to be reunited with them. In addition, 30% of survey respondents indicated the presence of family in Australia had contributed to their decision to migrate, while 51% already had family members living in Australia when they moved there, and 52% had encouraged other family members to move to Australia.

While few interviewees indicated friends had migrated as a direct result of their living in Australia, the maintenance of networks extended to the development of new friendship groups made up of New Zealanders in Australia. In most cases this was the result of new bonds with not previously known New Zealanders developed through shared “homeland” connections, and shared activities, often involving sporting groups. For some migrants the fact another person was a New Zealander was sufficient to lead to ongoing social contact, as predicted by social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) which suggests people are positively biased towards in-group members. Socialising with New Zealanders in Australia ensured the everyday lives of these migrants were mediated by constant contact with other New Zealanders living in Australia keeping the New Zealand aspect of their identity alive. These friendships reinforced migrants’ continued loyalty to New Zealand as indicated by this interviewee: “It’s ... like being at home ... you’ve got your New Zealand friends, you hear about New Zealand all the time and you go and watch the rugby together, still cheering for New Zealand”.

However, while interviewees mentioned close linkages with other New Zealand migrants, this aspect of migrant life was less evident in the survey responses, especially among respondents who had lived in Australia for 11 or more years. Maori respondents and those who had lived in Australia for 0-2 years were, however, more likely to indicate most of their closest friends were from New Zealand (true of 50% of both groups compared with 32% overall). There was a statistically significant difference between the two time periods (see Table 7.4). This difference between interview and survey responses is important because the small interview study could have led to the conclusion that New Zealanders in Australia only make friends with other New Zealanders. The larger sample from more diverse sources demonstrated that migrants were blending in to Australian society.

#### *Summary of Transnationalism Considerations*

As expected, New Zealanders in the early years after migration maintained both links and pride in their identity as New Zealanders, while becoming, to some extent, transnationalists. This supports the view that community is a mental construct not

confined to co-residence in the same location (Cohen, 1985; Vertovec, 2001). However, the data show that that after being resident in Australia for more than 10 years a transnational identity was replaced by a closer connection with Australia. In addition, while New Zealanders in this study retained emotional and social links with New Zealand, few maintained economic or political ties with New Zealand. Thus according to Portes' typology New Zealanders living in Australia could be described as socio-cultural transnationals but not as economic or political transnationals (Portes et al., 1999).

Transnationals are well integrated migrants. Theorists, such as Berry (2001), argue optimal adaptation and integration is achieved when migrants are motivated to actively maintain their original culture at the same time as participating fully in their adopted country. This describes New Zealand migrants to Australia.

Unlike many migrants, those New Zealanders eligible for Australian citizenship are in the fortunate position of not having to forsake their original citizenship to take up Australian citizenship. The policy that enables New Zealand migrants in Australia to have dual citizenship is supportive of their transnational identity. In addition, they can move freely backwards and forwards between the two countries (28% of migrant survey respondents had lived in Australia on more than one occasion). However, in keeping with Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, few of this sample have chosen to take up Australian citizenship due, in part, to ongoing allegiance to New Zealand, and also because there were few advantages in becoming citizens for those who moved to Australia prior to the 2001 legislative changes.

Ongoing ties with New Zealand were of considerable importance for many Maori in this study as demonstrated by Maori interviewees' political ties with New Zealand, ambivalence about family left behind, and sense of attachment to tribal land, and survey respondents' higher levels of emotional attachment, sense that they belonged in New Zealand, and encouragement of family members to join them in Australia, compared with survey respondents overall. A connection with extended family and to tribal land is a strong part of the spiritual and emotional identity of Maori. In addition, for a numerically

small cultural group (635,100 resident in New Zealand in 2005) (Statistics New Zealand, 2006a) to have, reportedly, one in seven of that number resident in Australia (Te Puni Kokiri, 2004) is significant. Therefore, the retention of ties with the Maori diaspora, including the second generation, is arguably more important than it is for other New Zealanders. It is therefore timely that the New Zealand Maori Affairs Department, Te Puni Kokiri, was conducting a study of Maori in Australia during 2006.

#### Theme Six: Migrants and Stayers: Constructing Identities and Justifying Decisions

Differences in the way migrants and stayers construct their identity and justify the decision to move or to stay are discussed in relation to migrants and stayers views of themselves, Australians, New Zealanders and the two countries.

##### *Differences between the Self-Image of Migrants and Stayers*

RQ28: Will New Zealand migrants to Australia construct a different view of themselves and New Zealand in comparison with non-migrants?

RQ29: To what extent will New Zealand migrants to Australia see themselves as an in-group with more positive characteristics than their out-groups, those who have stayed behind and Australians?

RQ30: Will those who stayed in New Zealand describe themselves more positively than those who have gone to Australia or, indeed, Australians?

The perspectives of migrants and stayers differed in the ways they viewed New Zealanders, Australians, and the characteristics of migrants. Migrants re-assessed their views of themselves, of Australia, and of New Zealand and its people as a result of their interaction with Australians. They saw themselves as adopting the characteristics of Australians; as becoming more relaxed, more positive, more tolerant and less reserved. As quotes from interviews illustrated, migrants construed Australians positively, citing their positive approach to life, and direct, honest communication style as preferable to the approach to life and communication style of New Zealanders. Social constructionism

(Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Gergen, 1985; Pearce, 1994, 1995) explains why established meanings are challenged whenever someone moves to a new situation and interacts with new groups, and why perspectives of New Zealand migrants to Australia differed from those of New Zealanders who have not migrated.

In contrast while generally positive about New Zealand itself, migrants cited negative aspects of life in New Zealand, such as the climate, ongoing financial difficulties, and ongoing racial tension as factors which contributed to their decision to move across the Tasman. On the other hand, stayers did not mention these factors to the same extent and were more positive about life in New Zealand.

Migrants exaggerated the differences between themselves and stayers, as predicted by social identity theory which proposed that individuals defined themselves according to social group membership and sought a positive self-definition with reference to social groups (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Evaluating one's own group positively and other groups negatively contributes to the positive self-identity of an individual. In defining their social identity, individuals are positively biased towards members of their own group, and exaggerate differences between groups and similarities within groups, thus increasing differences between their in-group and out-groups.

Both migrants and stayers saw themselves as having more positive characteristics than the other group. Migrants saw themselves as risk takers, and people who wanted more from life than those who had stayed behind. They viewed friends and family members who had remained in New Zealand as complacent, lacking in drive, and unwilling to take risks. Interviews and surveys showed that these New Zealand migrants to Australia had, in hindsight, constructed their motivation to move across the Tasman as evidence of their goal oriented, adventurous attitude to life which they felt their stayer friends and family members lacked. There was a sense in which the migrants saw themselves as superior to family members and friends who had not chosen to migrate.

While largely positive about Australians, migrants also saw themselves as in some ways superior to Australians, notably in terms of race relations and their attitudes to work. This indicates the designation of in-groups and out-groups is more complicated than social identity theory suggests, and lends support to Deaux' view that the social comparison processes are complex and multi-dimensional (2000). Members of a social group may see themselves as superior to another group in some, but not all respects.

Stayers also evaluated their own group positively and other groups, Australians and New Zealand migrants, less positively. Although some stayers also viewed migrants as adventurous, confident, and determined, others viewed migrants as restless and unable to settle. In general, New Zealanders who had remained in New Zealand constructed positive reasons for staying at home, seeing their own desire to stay in New Zealand as evidence of their settled and stable position in life. They described New Zealanders as relaxed, friendly, generous, go-getting, do-it-yourselfers, with a strong work ethic. Those who stayed in New Zealand were more critical of Australians than migrants, seeing Australians as loud and brash and Australian society as being "too American".

*Migrants' Justification of Decision to Migrate and Stayers' Justification of Decision to Live in New Zealand and Explanation for Family Member's Decision to Move to Australia*

RQ31: Will migrants express more dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand than stayers?

RQ32: In what ways will migrants rationalise their decision to move from a country with many positive features and how will stayers rationalise the decision of family members to move to Australia, and their own decision to remain in their homeland?

H8: Migrants will express more dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand than stayers.

As predicted by social identity theory migrant interviewees and survey respondents indicated positive benefits and characteristics of living in Australia, expressed in high levels of satisfaction with life in Australia, and made some negative comments about stayers and about life in New Zealand. Migrants justified their decision to move to

Australia according to a cognitive dissonance theory interpretation in which reasons to justify actions provide equilibrium and a stable sense of self.

Cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957; Harmon-Jones & Mills, 1999) predicts that, in order to reduce the dissonance which occurs when people are exposed to information inconsistent with their beliefs, individuals seek out information supporting their beliefs, minimise the importance of dissonant material, and ignore or avoid information likely to increase dissonance. Migrants rationalised their decision to move from a country with many positive features by focusing on the aspects of New Zealand life they were dissatisfied with, and on the positive features of life in Australia. Thus many migrants reduced any dissonance they felt about living in Australia by highlighting factors that supported their decision, while overlooking factors that made them regret leaving “home”.

Migrants expressed a greater level of dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand than did stayers. Cognitive dissonance theory, with its prediction that people ignore or minimise the importance of dissonant material, provides an explanation for the differing perspectives of migrants and stayers. Migrants selectively focused on aspects of life in New Zealand which they were not satisfied with, while stayers chose to focus on positive aspects of life in New Zealand and filtered out any dissatisfaction with life in New Zealand from their accounts. Asking what made them remain in New Zealand led participants to justify their decision.

Stayers rationalised the decision of family members’ move to Australia and their own decision to remain in their homeland. They described New Zealand in more positive terms than migrants, emphasising New Zealand’s superior race relations, greater autonomy from the United States, lack of corruption, and easy access to the outdoors. In addition, they viewed aspects of Australian culture more negatively than the migrants, seeing Australians as loud, brash, and overly influenced by the United States. They also expressed a high level of satisfaction with life in New Zealand.

Cognitive dissonance theory explains the marked difference in the perceptions of the two groups regarding reasons for the decision to move to Australia, where stayers justified their family member's decision to move across the Tasman by citing greater opportunities in Australia (pull factors) rather than dissatisfaction with aspects of life in New Zealand (push factors). The stayers experienced cognitive dissonance when a family member or friend chose to leave New Zealand and therefore ignored reasons which related to dissatisfaction with aspects of life in New Zealand, putting more emphasis on factors relating to the economic benefits of living in Australia. Both the migrants and stayers justified their actions and those of family members in order to provide equilibrium and a stable sense of self.

*Summary of Differences between Migrants and Stayers Identities and Justification of Decisions*

Despite being positive about their decision to move to Australia and justifying it, New Zealand migrants still saw themselves as New Zealanders, albeit superior ones to the stayers. They maintained contact with home by phoning regularly, visiting often and encouraging New Zealand relatives to visit, so there was constant traffic back and forth across the Tasman. This provided opportunities for comparison between themselves and stayers, and between the two societies. However, some migrants said they mixed with so many New Zealanders that they felt as though they had brought the best part of New Zealand to Australia.

New Zealand migrants to Australia were more positive about Australia than stayers, and saw themselves as superior to stayers in some respects. They construed themselves as having more positive personal qualities and having higher goals and aspirations than family and friends left behind. Migrants saw themselves as risk-taking, trail-blazing pioneers who took their chances.

In contrast, stayers having a more positive view of their homeland and less positive view of Australia justified their decision to remain in New Zealand by citing these. Stayers explained their family member's decision to move to Australia in terms of the



opportunities available there, ignoring reasons which related to negative aspects of life in New Zealand. When a family member chose to move to Australia stayer family members experienced cognitive dissonance and justified their family member's decision to leave by viewing migrants as dissatisfied and unstable and themselves as satisfied and contented. As social identity theory would predict, stayers had a tendency to view migrants as, to some extent, disloyal members of an out-group even though they were members of their own family.

The results of this study lend some support to Boneva and Frieze's (2001) findings that migrants tend to be more work oriented, have higher achievement and power motivations and lower affiliation motivation and family centrality than those who choose to stay at home. In general, New Zealanders in Australia talked about their migration experience as if they had proactively responded to their circumstances and did not perceive themselves as pushed by circumstances beyond their control. However, in this study one group "aspirers" differed from those identified by Boneva and Frieze's (2001) study in that, while they were somewhat dissatisfied with opportunities in New Zealand, and some aspects of that society, they retained affection for and adherence to what they saw as essential aspects of New Zealand culture such as New Zealanders being hard workers.

One of the puzzles confronting migration researchers is why, despite experiencing the same conditions in their country of origin, only a small proportion of a country's population chooses to migrate (Faist, 2000). This study provides a partial answer to that puzzle by suggesting that migrators and stayers had different priorities and perceptions. This explains why both groups expressed high levels of satisfaction with life in their country of residence. It also explains why migrants expressed dissatisfaction with aspects of life in New Zealand, while stayers expressed high levels of satisfaction.

Together social identity theory, cognitive dissonance theory, and Boneva and Frieze's proposed personality characteristics help explain the differing perspectives of migrants and stayers observed in this study. However, their views were more complex than these theories suggest. Neither migrants nor stayers were totally negative about their out-

groups. Stayers could see positive features of migrants' motivation to live in Australia, and of Australians, and some expressed negative views regarding New Zealand and their decision not to move. Similarly migrants espoused many positive features of life in New Zealand, and could see negative aspects of Australia.

The changing in-group/out-group allegiance and differing constructions of the identity of migrants and stayers that occur when New Zealanders migrate to Australia have the potential to negatively affect relationships within families with members on both sides of the Tasman. Misunderstandings and friction may arise on return visits and, in addition, adjustments to identity would be necessary should New Zealanders who have lived in Australia eventually return to their country of origin.

## Chapter 10: Implications and Conclusions

This study is particularly timely as the increase in numbers of New Zealanders living in Australia has led policy makers on both sides of the Tasman to express concerns about the effects of such mass migration (Khoo, 2002; Zodgekar, 2005). This study contributes to knowledge in three key ways. First, it has demonstrated the complexity of migrant identity when people migrate to another very similar country. New Zealand migrants to Australia revised their identity in light of their new experiences, yet retained aspects of their New Zealand identity as part of their ongoing, evolving identity. Second, this study shows how migrants make sense of their motivations to move to Australia. Use of a phenomenological, grounded research approach has produced rich data which demonstrates how New Zealanders living in Australia perceived, described, and made sense of their motivations to migrate. Over time, initial factors which motivated the study's participants to move to Australia merged with other factors which sustained or justified their decision to live in Australia. The study suggests New Zealanders fit easily into Australian society as they share many attitudes and values with Australians. Third, the study demonstrates that while migrants and stayers hold broadly similar views about New Zealand and Australia they differ in some of their perceptions and personal priorities. The effect and implications of each of these themes is now discussed under the headings: revising identity as migrants, making sense of the migration decision, and similarities and differences between migrants and stayers' priorities and perceptions.

### Revising Identity as Migrants

While participants in this study described life in Australia in very positive terms and felt they had made positive changes in their lives as a result of living in Australia, most interviewees retained their affection for and loyalty to New Zealand. Maori participants, in particular, retained an ongoing connection with New Zealand which included the land, their kin, and their *iwi* (tribe). At the same time, participants had a clearer perception of some aspects of New Zealand culture after having lived in another, albeit similar, culture. For many Maori interviewees the experience of moving to Australia was particularly positive as they experienced freedom from what they now saw as misconceptions about

and expectations of Maori in New Zealand that they had been unaware, or only dimly aware of, when they lived in New Zealand. These expectations had been both self-imposed and imposed by other members of society.

The current study suggests some migrants have a fixed, freeze-frame, and largely romanticised image of New Zealand, based on the country they left years earlier. Thus while New Zealand migrants adapted and changed it was the migrant, not the New Zealand, aspect of their identity that was developing as a result of interaction with Australians. Despite ongoing transnational connections with New Zealand as time went on New Zealand migrants to Australia become more Australian. However even those who had lived in Australia for a long time still retained affection for New Zealand. This was particularly evident in ongoing support for New Zealand sporting teams, as has been noted in studies of other migrant groups (Banks, & Werbner, in Bergin, 2002). It is important that receiving societies recognise such ongoing allegiance as natural and understand that it does not imply a lack of appreciation for, or lack of commitment towards the new country.

The results of the current study support the view that cultural and national identity is a deeply embedded and intertwined aspect of a person's individual identity (Anderson, 1991; Brewer, 1991; McLean, 2003). Migrants' positive feelings for their adopted homeland exist alongside deep-seated patriotism for their own country. This also has implications for a receiving society's acceptance of migrants. When the effects of population movements are considered, analysis of how people describe their own social identity assists in understanding the needs of migrants. Such analysis also assists multicultural societies in the long term both to assist newcomers to integrate, and to adapt to them.

Migrants inevitably experience some ambivalence. For New Zealand migrants who viewed living in Australia very positively, and who had moved to Australia in the absence of strong negative factors pushing them from New Zealand, this ambivalence resulted from their positive affection for both Australia and New Zealand. Migrants were

always aware of the possibility, however remote, of returning to New Zealand at some point in the future and they recognised that they could live happily in either society. Part of the ambivalence came about through New Zealanders' self-identification as superior to Australians. For example, they saw themselves as having a better work ethic, and as a superior kind of New Zealander having "get up and go". Some thought New Zealand was better than Australia, even though had chosen to move to and stay in Australia.

Migration provides broader horizons and added perspectives through which to view previous life experiences. Thus migrants were more critical of, or more regretful about, some aspects of New Zealand life than they had been previously, although they still viewed New Zealand very positively. This created ambivalence about New Zealand for those who held conflicting views. These migrants, while viewing New Zealand very positively, considered Australia was even better.

Travel had a bonding effect for Maori/*Pakeha* relationships. When resident in New Zealand, some Maori interviewees had perceived *Pakeha* as their out-group. However, in Australia the in-group of some Maori had changed to encompass all New Zealanders in Australia, which resulted in Maori having greater affection for *Pakeha* than they had had when they lived in New Zealand. This sense of shared, rather than the opposing, identities creates the possibility of a positive carry-over effect if migrants return to New Zealand to live.

### Making Sense of the Migration Decision

One of the initial puzzles presented by this study was why, despite having such positive views of their "homeland" to the extent that many interviewees described New Zealand as a kind of paradise, do so many New Zealanders choose to move to Australia? The answer this study's participants provided was that they moved to a place that they perceived as even more of a paradise in some respects, as Australia offered them greater economic, lifestyle, and personal opportunities.

Not only was Australia more of a paradise, it was not difficult to live there. The two countries were in close proximity, access was easy as there were no visa requirements, Australia was already familiar prior to migration through holidays, friends and family already lived there, the two cultures were very similar, and it was a “safe” place to move because of its similarity to New Zealand. Financial, emotional, and psychological “costs” of moving to Australia were relatively low and it was a decision which could be easily reversed. This lack of finalisability is evident in studies examining migrations between other first world countries (see for example, Gold, 1997, a study of Israelis in the United States).

New Zealanders living in Australia who appreciated the advantages of life in Australia, while retaining pride in their national identity as New Zealanders, developed, at least in the period 3-10 years after taking up residence there, a transnational socio-cultural identity, which encompassed selected aspects of both societies. This process was aided by the ease with which New Zealanders fitted into Australian society and their level of acceptance by Australians.

The current study uses an extended definition of transnationalism, encompassing migrants who exhibit social and cultural transnationalism, and not confined to migrants engaged in economic and political activities in more than one country. New Zealanders living in Australia demonstrated attachment to, and contact with, both countries and could be described as having two simultaneous cultural and national identities.

However, for New Zealand migrants to Australia, transnationalism appears to be a transitory state, as links with New Zealand diminish over time. In the current study participants who had lived in Australia for up to 10 years had closer associations with New Zealand than those who had lived there for longer periods. The more ties New Zealanders formed in Australia, the less transnational and more Australian the individual’s identity became. The findings of this study therefore support the view that transnationalism is part of the acculturation process (Kivisto, 2001). The durability of transnationalism over time has implications for planners and policy makers in both

Australia and New Zealand, and is therefore worthy of further research. Transnational ties are of particular importance for the identity of Maori living in Australia, and their *whanau* (extended family) and *iwi* (tribe) in New Zealand. The identity of second generation Maori in Australia is therefore an area particularly worthy of further research.

Migration can no longer be viewed as permanent or one way (Bedford, 2001). Instead, increasing numbers of people are spending periods of time living in other countries before moving back to their country of origin, or on to a third country. Some New Zealanders did not make a conscious choice to move to Australia. They came on extended holidays or on the way to somewhere else and stayed because it was possible to do so due to the fluid, porous boundaries between the two countries enabling the free flow of individuals. However, changes to the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement in 2001 have restricted that freedom to some extent as many New Zealanders no longer qualify for permanent residency and the benefits that provides. The full effects of the changes are yet to be felt and have implications for the composition of Australian and New Zealand societies.

For New Zealand migrants in Australia, factors which had motivated them to move across the Tasman merged with factors which were unknown, unclear or impossible to predict prior to departure. These factors, which included the benefits of a warmer climate, the perception that Australia was a more relaxed and tolerant society, absence of racial tension, and the belief by some Maori that life in Australia freed them from negative stereotypes, were a result of positive experiences in Australia, and became sustaining and justifying factors.

Findings from this study indicate that, as suggested by other researchers (for example, Ryan, 2004), migration is more complex than the push-pull model suggests. The push-pull model incompletely describes the motivations of those who migrate from one first world country to another and who are not necessarily either pushed or pulled, but instead, motivated by such things as a desire for a change or the need for more adventure in their

lives. These personal satisfaction factors are inadequately factored into in the push-pull model.

The fluidity of movement typical of modern day “migrants” points to the need for a new approach to migration which encompasses both the lack of permanence of many contemporary migrations and the effect of the post-migration experience. Migrants’ subsequent experiences merge with their initial motivations to provide sustaining and justifying factors which keep a migrant in their new homeland or conversely, motivate them to either return to their country of origin or migrate to another country. Such decisions, resulting from both rational assessment and emotional factors, depend on perceived costs and benefits of remaining in their adopted country, compared with those afforded by returning to their country of origin, or moving on to a third country. While transnationalist approaches acknowledge the possibility of “backwards and forwards” movement they do not account for sustaining and justifying factors, or for the weighing up of costs and benefits.

**Similarities and Differences Between Migrants and Stayers Priorities and Perceptions**  
By studying both migrants and those who had not migrated but had family members and friends who had moved to Australia, this study has identified areas where misunderstanding and friction may arise when, as is increasingly common, families straddle the Tasman. Thus on return visits, migrants might learn not to praise their new homeland and to refrain from unfavourable comparisons between the two countries, in the interests of family harmony.

A comparison of the accounts of migrants and stayers revealed many similarities in the attitudes of the two groups, especially their attitudes to New Zealand and New Zealanders. Both groups viewed New Zealand very positively believing, for example, that New Zealanders were good workers, that New Zealand was a “great” place to raise a family, and that New Zealand had a more principled stance towards the United States. While the two groups have very similar positive views about their attitudes to New Zealand, apart from migrant interviewees’ expressing dissatisfaction with race relations policies in New



Zealand, they differed in the way they regarded Australia. Migrants thought Australia had advantages over New Zealand, and viewed it as a very good place to live. In contrast, stayers did not see or did not want to see advantages to life in Australia to the same extent. In particular, migrants and stayers diverged over their perception of Australian's typically "upfront" interpersonal communication style.

The findings of this study support the predictions of both cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) and social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), by demonstrating migrants and stayers' strong need to reduce cognitive dissonance, to hold self-justifying beliefs, and to have a positive self-image. In addition to differing perceptions of Australia and Australians, migrants and stayers had differing personal priorities. Migrants saw themselves as having a stronger sense of adventure and desire to take on new challenges, while stayers valued stability and certainty.

Differing perspectives, the need for a positive self-image, and the need to justify decisions may result in misunderstandings and intolerance as both migrants and stayers seek to have family members agree with their "correct", socially constructed perception of reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). While some migrants had successfully persuaded other family members to move to Australia, others were frustrated by their family members' inaction despite their urgings and explanations of the many benefits of life in Australia. Similarly, migrants' lack of contact with the reality of life in New Zealand led them to hold inaccurate, romanticised or negative views of New Zealand which was a source of frustration for some stayers. Some Maori migrants did, however, acknowledge that the situation of Maori in New Zealand had improved since they had left and that their views on attitudes towards Maori race relations may not reflect the current reality.

This freeze frame effect has implications for New Zealand migrants to Australia who choose to return to New Zealand to live and also for migrants' interactions with family and friends on visits "home". Returnees may experience unforeseen difficulties readjusting to life in New Zealand as predicted by reverse "culture shock" (Jandt, 2003). In addition, migrants with an idealised, romanticised view of New Zealand may become disillusioned

on their return when they discover the reality of life in New Zealand does not live up to the view they have held in their imagination during their years in Australia. This adjustment of returnees is an area worthy of further research.

These observed themes have implications for the New Zealand government, and for Australian immigration policy and practice. It is inevitable that New Zealanders will continue to move across the Tasman, as the move is motivated, at least in part, by the desire for personal development, and not only by the relative economic conditions in Australia and New Zealand. It is also evident that while many will remain in Australia permanently, some migrants will return to New Zealand. However the extent of return migration cannot be predicted with any accuracy as the decision to return is motivated by emotional, rather than rational considerations. Given the centrality of family to New Zealanders who talked about the possibility of returning to New Zealand, this emerges as the key consideration, along with a more general longing for the familiarity of “home”.

New Zealand migrants in Australia demonstrated a wide range of attitudes to race relations in New Zealand indicating that this is a complex issue. However, findings of the current study suggest that New Zealand governments’ bi-cultural policy emphasising partnership between Maori and *Pakeha* along with attempts to compensate for past injustices to Maori and to assist Maori to participate in society at the same levels as other New Zealanders are contributing factors to some *Pakeha* New Zealanders’ decisions to move to Australia. As some Maori commented on the bonding effect of migration which they said lessened Maori/*Pakeha* divisions, it would be interesting to investigate returnees, especially Maori returnees, who have revised their view of *Pakeha* New Zealanders while living in Australia, upon their return to bi-cultural New Zealand.

Views expressed in the current study suggest that economic and political union with Australia is not acceptable to stayers who are fiercely independent and would not support moves for New Zealand to unite with Australia.

### Implications for Australian Immigration Policy and Practice

New Zealanders are unforced migrants who choose to move to Australia and integrate readily into a culture with similar values, attitudes and history, contributing, as do all migrants, to Australia's cultural and economic development. The New Zealand culture resonates rather than clashes with Australian society so that New Zealanders are less likely to suffer from culture shock. This study shows that New Zealanders are highly satisfied with their decision to relocate. They are fully aware they have choices and know they can return to New Zealand at any time, but most choose to stay.

Refugees and other forced migrants might describe Australia as a place where they can be free. New Zealanders also like living in Australia because they perceive it as a place where they can be free, by which they mean free from the restrictions of New Zealand society, such as what some migrants perceive as reserved "prim and proper" behaviour, indirect communication styles, and negative expectations of Maori, of which they were previously unaware. Thus, migration to Australia provides New Zealanders with opportunities for personal as well as economic development.

The impermanent nature of much modern day migration, and the fluidity of country of residence evident in the backwards and forwards movement of some transnationalists have implications for policies and population planning in both Australia and New Zealand. Further research into the contribution of New Zealanders to Australian society, and the effects of the legislative changes on the long term commitment of New Zealand migrants to Australia, as well as the effect of migration on the skills base and economies of both countries would assist planners and policy makers on both sides of the Tasman.

### Areas for Further Research

It is recommended that further research be conducted in the following areas:

1. Using the methods devised for this study, a comprehensive stratified study of New Zealanders in Australia based on demographics provided by census data be undertaken to include New Zealanders living in each of the Australian states to

ascertain whether or not the trends observed in the current study are generalisable to migrants living in other Australian locations.

2. A study of the long-term effects of the February 2001 changes in immigration legislation to determine their impact on New Zealand migrants' commitment to Australia and on their satisfaction level through comparisons with the findings of the current study.
3. A study of migrants who moved to Australia from New Zealand after migrating to New Zealand from a third country. Such a study could include both those who moved just before the February 2001 legislative changes and those who moved after that time. The characteristics and motivation of third country migrants could be compared and contrasted with those who stayed in New Zealand after migrating there from another country and with the findings of the present study.
4. A study of the national and cultural identity of second generation Maori and *Pakeha* migrants to examine the extent to which New Zealand national identity and transnational connections endure to the second generation.
5. A study of return migrants' adjustment to New Zealand after returning from Australia to identify any problems they encounter and to assess the extent to which return migrants consider they have broadened their perspectives and become more tolerant as a result of their experiences in Australia.

### Conclusion

This study has unravelled the details of how migration between two similar countries affects social identity which will aid understanding of the effects of migration between other closely related countries. The study began by asking how the experience of migration to Australia affects New Zealanders who migrate. In project one, interviews conducted with 31 migrants uncovered five major themes. This was followed up with a survey of the literature and analysis of interview themes to discern 32 research questions. These were tested through project two, a survey of 309 New Zealanders living in Australia; project three, stayer interviews and survey which looked at New Zealanders views of the motivations of those who had left, and their perceptions of New Zealand and Australian societies; and further analysis of project one interviews.

This study has contributed a view of transnationalism which emphasises social and cultural connections, and a revised approach to migration to encompass both personal factors in the migration decision, and migrants' revisions of their reasons for migrating to include subsequently discovered factors which justified their decision and kept them in Australia.

New Zealanders come to Australia because they can, because it is familiar to them, because there are more abundant and better paying jobs there, and for personal reasons such as the desire for a change. Some see themselves as superior to New Zealanders who stayed behind, and as superior to Australians in some ways. They become transnationalists, with an ability to function in two societies. The bonds between migrants and New Zealand are strong because of family and emotional ties. New Zealand migrants are extremely positive about Australia, and Australians, who they see as positive and accepting. In general, they are confident and happy in their lives in Australia, while still holding the idea that their identity is bound up in two societies. There is some ambivalence and consideration of return migration. However, unsurprisingly, the longer they stay in Australia the more they see Australia as home. Those who do return bring broader perspectives and more tolerant attitudes by which to measure New Zealand.

## References

- Abrams, J., O'Connor, J., & Giles, H. (2003). Identity and intergroup communication. In W. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Cross-cultural and intercultural communication* (pp. 209-224). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alati, R., Najman, J., & Williams, G. (2004). The mental health of Filipino-born women 5 and 14 years after they have given birth in Australia: A longitudinal study. *Health Sociological Review*, 13, 145-156.
- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. (Special issue: Immigrant adaptation and native-born responses in the making of Americans). *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 826-874. Retrieved September 22, 2006, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.
- Allen, S. (2005). Exodus to Australia surges 60pc in May. *Dominion Post*. Retrieved June 1, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- Altman, D. (2006). *New Zealand asks its citizens to come home*. International Herald Tribune. Retrieved May 26, 2006, from [http://www.workpermit.com/news/2006\\_02\\_05/australia/nz\\_wants\\_citizens\\_home.htm](http://www.workpermit.com/news/2006_02_05/australia/nz_wants_citizens_home.htm)
- Altrocchi, J., & Altrocchi, L. (1995). Polyfaceted psychological acculturation in Cook Islanders. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26(3), 426-440.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Revised ed.). London: Verso.
- Australian Broadcasting Corporation Online. (2006, April 12). *Melbourne men win Italian Parliament seats*. Retrieved 25 August, 2006, from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/newsitems/200604/s1614542.htm>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2001). *Australian social trends: Population characteristics: Populations of Australia and New Zealand: A comparison*. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved September 26, 2003, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/austats/abs>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2002). *Australian social trends 2002: Population composition: New Zealanders in Australia*. Retrieved September 26, 2003, from

<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@nsf/0/0658217EBA753C2CCA256CAE0053FA3?Open>

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2003a). *1301.0: Year Book Australia*. Retrieved July 12, 2006, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@nsf/0/0658217EBA753C2CCA256CAE0053FA3?Open>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2003b). *Year book Australia 2003: Population international migration*. Retrieved July 16, 2003, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/Ausstats/abs>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2004). *AusStats: Feature Article: Population by Country of Birth*. Retrieved June 7, 2005, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/austats/abs>
- Awatere, D. (1984). *Maori sovereignty*. Auckland: Broadsheet Publications.
- Babbie, E. (2005). *The basics of social research* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Bale, T. (2001, April 27). This country no longer great place to bring up children. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Barth, F. (1999). Boundaries and connections. In A. Cohen (Ed.), *Signifying identities: Anthropological perspectives on boundaries and contested values* (pp. 17-36). Florence, KY: Routledge.
- Baxter, L. A. (1994). Thinking dialogically about communication in personal relationships. In R. Conville (Ed.), *Uses of "structure" in communication studies* (pp. 23-37). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues and dialectics*. New York: Guilford.
- Beatson, D. (2006, March 15). Pity about the kids. *The Independent Business Weekly*. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- Bedford, R. (2001). 2001: Reflections on the spatial odysseys of New Zealanders. *New Zealand Geographer*, 57(1), 49-54.

- Bedford, R. (2003). *New Zealand: The politicization of immigration*. Retrieved May 31, 2005, from <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Profiles/display.cfm?ID=86>
- Bedford, R., Ho, E., & Hugo, G. (2003). Trans-Tasman migration in context: Recent flows of New Zealanders revisited. *People and Place*, 11(4), 53-62.
- Belich, J. (1996). *Making peoples: A history of the New Zealanders*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Bell, C. (1996). *Inventing New Zealand: Inventing myths of Pakeha identity*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Bell, C. (1997). The 'real' New Zealand: Rural mythologies perpetuated and commodified. *The Social Science Journal*, 34(2), 145. Retrieved August 4, 2003, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.
- Bell, M., & Ward, G. (2000). Comparing temporary mobility with permanent migration. *Tourism Geographies*, 2(1), 87-107. Retrieved September 16, 2003, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality*. London: Penguin.
- Bergin, P. (2002). Maori sport and cultural identity in Australia. *Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 13(3), 257-269. Retrieved January 30, 2003, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Berry, J. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 615-631. Retrieved February 16, 2003, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Birrell, B., & Rapson, V. (2001). New Zealanders in Australia: The end of an era? *People and Place*, 9(1), 61-74.
- Bishop, R. L. (1996). *Collaborative research stories*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. L., & Glynn, G. (1999). Researching in Maori contexts: An interpretation of participatory consciousness. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 20(2), 167-198. Retrieved January 28, 2003, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.



- Boneva, B., & Frieze, I. H. (2001). Toward a concept of a migrant personality. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 477-491. Retrieved March 6, 2003, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Borell, B. (2005). Living in the city ain't so bad: Cultural identity for young Maori in South Auckland. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 191-206). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Bourque, L. B., & Fielder, E. P. (2003). *How to conduct self-administered and mail surveys* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Boyd, M. (1989). Family and personal networks in international migration: Recent developments and new agenda. *International Migration Review*, 23(3), 638-670. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from [http:// www.jstor.org](http://www.jstor.org).
- Bragge, P. (2003). Australia-country that helps its mates? *Campus Review*, November 12-18, 24-25.
- Brash, D. (2004). *An address by Don Brash Leader of the National Party to the Orewa Rotary Club*. Retrieved July 20, 2006, from [http://www.national.org.nz/speech\\_article.aspx?ArticleID+1614](http://www.national.org.nz/speech_article.aspx?ArticleID+1614)
- Brett, J. (2003). John Howard and the Australian legend. *Arena Magazine*, June-July 2003, 19-24.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(5), 475-482.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). Multiple identities and identity transition: Implications for Hong Kong. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(2), 187-197.
- Brown, R. (1997). *Cultural questions: New Zealand identity in a transnational age*. London: Kakapo Books.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 745-778.
- Bushnell, P., & Choy, W. K. (2001, 29-30 March). *Treasury Working Paper 01/07: "Go west, young man, go west!"*? Retrieved August 16, 2006, from <http://www.treasury.govt.nz/workingpapers/2001/twp01-7.pdf>

- Buttrick, J. (1992). Migration between Canada and the United States, 1970-85: Some new estimates. *International Migration Review*, 26(4), 1448-1456. Retrieved March 13, 2006, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.
- Carmichael, G. (1993). Trans-Tasman migration: Historical, contemporary and future perspectives. In G. A. Carmichael (Ed.), *Trans-Tasman migration: Trends, causes and consequences*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Services.
- Catley, B. (2001a). Leaving the first world. *Quadrant*, July 2001, 62-70.
- Catley, B. (2001b). Politics. In B. Brown (Ed.), *New Zealand and Australia: Where are we going?* (pp. 13-19). Wellington: The New Zealand Institute of International Affairs.
- Catley, B. (2001c). Will Australia and New Zealand unite? *Quadrant*, Jan 2001, 28-36. Retrieved July 21, 2003, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.
- Catley, B. (Ed.). (2002). *NZ-Australian relations: Moving together or drifting apart?* Wellington: Dark Horse.
- Cheng, D. (2005, June 14). Where did that come from? New Zealand's anti-nuclear stance. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- Clement, R., Noels, K., & Deneault, B. (2001). Interethnic contact, identity, and psychological adjustment: The mediating and moderating roles of communication. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 559-577. Retrieved April 20, 2003, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Cohen, A. (1985). *Symbolic construction of community*. Florence, KY: Routledge.
- Cohen, A. (1999a). Introduction: Discriminating relations: Identity, boundary and authenticity. In A. Cohen (Ed.), *Signifying identities: Anthropological perspectives on boundaries and contested values* (pp. 1-13). Florence, KY: Routledge.
- Cohen, A. (1999b). Peripheral vision: Nationalism, national identity and the objective correlative in Scotland. In A. Cohen (Ed.), *Signifying identities: Anthropological perspectives on boundaries and contested values* (pp. 145-169). Florence, KY: Routledge.
- Cohen, A. (Ed.). (1982). *Belonging: Identity and social organisation in British rural cultures*. Manchester University Press.

- Colic-Peisker, V., & Walker, I. (2003). Human capital, acculturation and social identity: Bosnian refugees in Australia. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 13, 337-360.
- Collier, M.-J. (1998). Researching cultural identity: Reconciling interpretive and postcolonial perspectives. In D. V. Tanno & A. Gonzalez (Eds.), *Communication and identity across cultures* (pp. 122-147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Collier, M.-J. (2000). Understanding cultural identities in intercultural communication: A ten-step inventory. In L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (9th ed., pp. 16-33). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Collins, S. (2005, March 12). Kiwi please come home. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved March 12, 2005, from <http://www.nzherald.co.nz>
- Collins, S. (2006, March 21). Kiwis flocking to Oz yet again. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved March 21, 2006, from <http://www.nzherald.co.nz>
- Condor, S. (2005). *Individual inclusion and exclusion: Migrants and 'nationals': Summary of project findings: Migrants and nationals panel study England*. Retrieved March 13, 2006, from [http://www.institute-of-governance.org/forum/Leverhulme/summaries/mig\\_nat\\_summary.html](http://www.institute-of-governance.org/forum/Leverhulme/summaries/mig_nat_summary.html)
- Conradson, D., & Latham, A. (2005). Friendship, networks and transnationality in a world city: Antipodean transmigrants in London. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(2), 287-305.
- Cotton, P. (2001). The movement of peoples: A view from over the ditch. In B. Brown (Ed.), *New Zealand and Australia: Where are we going?* (pp. 87-91). Wellington: The New Zealand Institute of International Affairs.
- Courier-Mail. (2006, May 13). *New Zealand's most able cross the Tasman*. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- Creswell, J. W. (1988). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen Unwin.
- Cunliffe, D. (2006). *Expat programme expands to Kiwis in Australia*. Press Release: New Zealand Government. Retrieved May 26, 2006, from <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA0605/S00250.htm>

- Currall, S., & Towler, A. J. (2003). Research methods in management and organizational research: Toward integration of qualitative and quantitative techniques. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 513-526). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dansey, H. (1975). A view on death. In M. King (Ed.), *Te ao hurihuri: The world moves on* (pp. 173-189). Wellington: Hicks, Smith and Sons.
- Darwall, R. (2005). John Howard's Australia. *Policy Review, August-September*(132), 57-68. Retrieved February 6, 2006, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.
- Day, D. (1998a). The demise of the digger: Australian identity in a post-colonial world. In D. Day (Ed.), *Australian identities* (pp. 73-95). Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing.
- Day, D. (1998b). Introduction. In D. Day (Ed.), *Australian identities* (pp. ix-xv). Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing.
- Deaux, K. (2000). Surveying the landscape of immigration: Social psychological perspectives. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 10*, 421-421. Retrieved June 20, 2006, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2005). *The island continent: Australia in brief*. Retrieved May 16, 2006, from [http://www.dfat.gov.au/aib/island\\_continent.html](http://www.dfat.gov.au/aib/island_continent.html)
- Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2006). *Italy country brief*. Retrieved August 25, 2006, from [http://www.dfat.gov.au/geo/italy/italy\\_brief.html](http://www.dfat.gov.au/geo/italy/italy_brief.html)
- Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (n.d.). *Australia Now: Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples*. Retrieved July 20, 2006, from [http://www.dfat.gov.au/facts/indg\\_overview.html](http://www.dfat.gov.au/facts/indg_overview.html)
- Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs. (2003). *Community information summary: The New Zealand born community*. Retrieved July 16, 2003, from <http://www.immi.gov.au/statistics/infosummary.source.htm>
- Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs. (2005). *Population Flows: Immigration Aspects 2003-04 Edition - New Zealand Movement*. Retrieved May 31, 2005, from [http://www.immi.gov.au/statistics/publications/popflows2003\\_4/index.htm](http://www.immi.gov.au/statistics/publications/popflows2003_4/index.htm)

- Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs. (2006a). *Fact Sheet: 17: New Zealanders in Australia*. Retrieved 27 July, 2006, from <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fac-sheets/17nz.htm>
- Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs. (2006b). *General skilled migration visa charges*. Retrieved July 27, 2006, from <http://www.immi.gov.au/allforms/990i/general-skilled-migration.htm>
- Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs. (2006c). *Key facts in immigration*. Retrieved 25 August, 2006, from <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/02key.htm>
- Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs. (2006d). *Key facts in immigration*. Retrieved August 25, 2006, from <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/02key.htm>
- DeVito, J., O'Rourke, S., & O'Neill, L. (2000). *Human communication: New Zealand edition*. Auckland: Pearson Education.
- Dick, B. (2002). *Grounded theory: A thumbnail sketch*. Retrieved May 14, 2004, from Southern Cross University Web site <http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arp/grounded.html>
- Dixson, M. (1999). *The imaginary Australian: Anglo-Celts and identity 1799 to the present*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Dovidio, J., & Esses, V. (2001). Immigrants and immigration: Advancing the psychological perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 375-387. Retrieved March 12, 2003, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Dupais, A., Hughes, D., Lauder, H., & Strathdee, R. (1999). What is means to be a 'New Zealander': Issues arising from a question on ethnicity. *New Zealand Sociology*, 14(1), 27-60.
- Durie, M. (1995). *Nga Matatini Maori: Diverse Maori realities*: Paper prepared for the Ministry of Health, Department of Maori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North: NZ.
- Dyrenfurth, N. (2005). Howard, hegemony and values: The left and the problem of mateship. *Arena Magazine*, December-January 2005-2006, 15-17.

- Eccleston, R. (2006, February 4). Australia bound: Why Brits are relocating here in numbers not seen since the days of the ten-pound Pom: The British are coming. *The Australian Magazine*. Retrieved February 28, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- Eckhardt, G. (2002). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organisations across Nations (Book Review). *Australian Journal of Management*, 27(1), 89-95.
- Ellis, D. (1995). Fixing communicative meaning. *Communication Research*, 22(5), 515-544.
- Ellis, D. (1999). *Crafting society: Ethnicity, class, and communication theory*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eriksen, A. (2006, February 6). 25 things you may not have known about New Zealand. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved February 6, 2006, from <http://www.nzherald.co.nz>
- Faist, T. (2000). *The volume and dynamics of international migration and transnational social spaces*: Oxford University Press.
- Faugier, J., & Sargeant, M. (1997). Sampling hard to reach populations. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 26, 790-797. Retrieved March 20, 2004, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Standford University.
- Fink, A. (2003a). *How to ask survey questions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fink, A. (2003b). *How to sample in surveys* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fink, A. (2003c). *The survey handbook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fitzgerald, E., Durie, M., Black, T., Taiapa, J., Durie, A., Christensen, I., et al. (2000). *Maori in New Zealand: Identity and diverse realities*: Te Hoe Nuku Roa Research Team, Department of Maori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North: NZ.
- Freeman, G. P. (1999). The quest for skill: A comparative analysis. In A. Bernstein & M. Weiner (Eds.), *Migration and refugee policies* (pp. 84-118). London: Continuum.
- Gamble, W. (1998, December 29). Australia closer than the mainland. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved July 25, 2004, from <http://www.nzherald.co.nz>

- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gelber, H. (2002). Is Australia's identity changing? *Quadrant*, July-August, 17-25.
- Gerbner, G. (1998). Cultivation analysis: An overview. *Mass Communication and Society*, 1, 175-194.
- Gergen, K. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40(3), 266-275.
- Ghosh, S., & Wang, L. (2003). Transnationalism and identity: A tale of two faces and multiple lives. *The Canadian Geographer*, 47(3), 269-282.
- Gibbs, M. (2001). Towards a strategy for undertaking cross-cultural collaborative research. *Society and Natural Resources*, 14, 673-687.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *Constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.
- Glick-Schiller, N., & Basch, L. (1995). From immigrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68(1), 48-63. Retrieved August 14, 2003, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Glick-Schiller, N., Basch, L., & Blanc-Szanton, C. (1992). Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration. In N. Glick Schiller, L. Basch & C. Blanc-Szanton (Eds.), *Towards a transnational perspective on migration: Race, class, ethnicity, and nationalism reconsidered* (pp. 1-24): New York Academy of Sciences.
- Goff, P. (1996, September 6). Good start for children simply makes good economic sense. *National Business Review*. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- Gold, S. (1997). Transnationalism and vocabularies of motive in international migration: The case of Israelis in the United States. *Sociological Perspectives*, 40(3), 409-427. Retrieved August 13, 2003, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.

- Gray, B. (1996). Irish women in London: National or hybrid diasporic identities? *National Women's Studies Journal*, 8(1), 85-109.
- Green, L. (2003). Attempting to ground ethnographic theory and practice. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 30(2), 133-145.
- Greenslade, L. (1992). The bright wave: Irish migrants in Britain in the 1980s. *Labour History Review*, 57(3), 23-24.
- Greer, G. (2003, 6-7 September). One big happy mob. *The Weekend Australian*, p. 24.
- Hall, E. T. (2000a). Context and meaning. In L. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (9th ed., pp. 34-42). New York: Doubleday.
- Hall, E. T. (2000b). Monochronic and polychronic time. In L. Samovar & Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (9th ed., pp. 280-286). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hannerz, U. (1996). *Transnational connections: Culture, people, places*. London: Routledge.
- Harmon-Jones, E., & Mills, J. (1999). An introduction to cognitive dissonance theory and an overview of current perspectives on the theory. In *Cognitive dissonance: Progress on a pivotal theory in social psychology* (pp. 3-21). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Harvey, C. (2003, 22 September). Envoy urges Anzac relationship to new frontier. *The Australian*, p. 12.
- Harvey, C. (2004, March 16). Kiwi plan to stop the 'brain drain' to Australia. *The Australian*, p. 23.
- Hazledine, T. (2002). Australia and NZ integration: Economic aspects. In B. Catley (Ed.), *NZ-Australia relations: Moving together or drifting apart?* (pp. 95-110). Wellington: Dark Horse.
- Hempenstall, P., Mein Smith, P., & Goldfinch, S. (2003). ANZAC neighbours: A hundred years of multiple ties. *New Zealand International Review*, 28(1), 26-29.
- Hermans, H. J., & Kempen, H. J. (1998). Moving cultures: The perilous problems of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society. *American Psychologist*, 53(10), 1111-1120.



- Hoadley, S. (2002). Trans-Tasman migration: Issues and politics. In B. Catley (Ed.), *NZ-Australia relations: Moving together or drifting apart?* (pp. 111-128). Wellington: Dark Horse.
- Hoadley, S. (2003). *Immigration policy: A steady convergence*. Retrieved August 28, 2006, from The University of Auckland, New Zealand Institute of International Affairs <http://www.nziaa.auckland.ac.nz>
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Berverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holton, R. (1998). Globalisation and Australian identities. In D. Day (Ed.), *Australian identity* (pp. 198-211). Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing.
- Horne, D. (1966). *The lucky country: Australia in the sixties* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Angus and Robertson.
- Hubbard, A. (2003, August 3). So close but so far, why Kiwis are so different to Aussies. *The Sunday Star-Times*. Retrieved September 19, 2003, from the Lexis-Nexis database.
- Hugo, G. (2003). *Australians moving: Overseas*. First Draft of a Chapter for International Careers for Australians, to be published by Global Exchange. Retrieved August 25, 2006, from [www.globalexchange.com.au/pdf/profhugo.pdf](http://www.globalexchange.com.au/pdf/profhugo.pdf)
- Hymans, J. E. (2005). International patterns in national identity content: The case of Japanese banknote iconography. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 5, 315-346. Retrieved May 21, 2006, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Iqbal, M. (2000). *The migration of high-skilled workers from Canada to the United States: Empirical evidence and economic reasons*. The Center for Comparative Immigration Studies. Retrieved August 20, 2003, from [www.ccis-ucsd.org/PUBLICATIONS](http://www.ccis-ucsd.org/PUBLICATIONS)
- Jandt, F. E. (2003). *Intercultural Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social identity*. London: Routledge.
- Karetu, T., & Waite, J. (1988). *Te Reo Maori*. Maori Language Commision. Retrieved May 15, 2006, from [www.tetaurawhiri.govt.nz/english/issues\\_e/reo/indiex.shtml](http://www.tetaurawhiri.govt.nz/english/issues_e/reo/indiex.shtml)

- Kelly, P. (2003). Canadian-Asian transnationalism. *The Canadian Geographer*, 47(3), 209-218. Retrieved October 15, 2004, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Kerr, R. (2001). The brain drain: Why New Zealanders are voting with their feet. *Policy*, 17(2). Retrieved January 11, 2006, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Kerr, R. (2002). The NZ-Australia relationship: A business perspective. In B. Catley (Ed.), *NZ-Australia relationship: Moving together or drifting apart?* (pp. 69-82). Wellington: Dark Horse.
- Khoo, S.-E. (2002). Immigration issues in Australia. *Joint Special Issue of the Journal of Population Research and the New Zealand Population Review*, 67-78.
- King, M. (2003). *The penguin history of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin.
- King, M. (Ed.). (1991). *Pakeha: The quest for identity in New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Kivisto. (2001). Theorizing transnational immigration: A critical review of current efforts. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4), 549-577.
- Kline, D. (2003). Push and pull factors in international nurse migration. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 35(2), 107-111.
- Kontuly, T., Smith, K., & Heaton, T. (1995). Culture as a determinant of reasons for migration. *The Social Science Journal*, 32(2), 179-193.
- Krausz, P. (2002). Australian identity: A cinematic roll call. *Australian Screen Education*(29), 24-29.
- Krippendorff, K. (1993). The past of communication's hoped-for future. *Journal of Communication*, 43(3), 34-44.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lee, E. (1966). A theory of migration. *Demography*, 3, 47-57.
- Levitt, P. (2001). *The transnational villagers*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Lewis, P. (2006). *The world today: Tonga's monarchy faces pro-democracy challenge*. ABC Online. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from <http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2006/s1677705.htm>
- Lidgard, J. M. (1993). Neglected international migrants: A study of returning New Zealanders. *New Zealand Population Review*, 19(1 & 2), 94-124.
- Lidgard, J. M. (1994). Return migration of New Zealanders: A profile of 1990 returnees. *New Zealand Journal of Geography*, 97, 3-13.
- Lidgard, J. M., & Gilson, C. (2002). Return migration of New Zealanders: Shuttle and circular migrants. *New Zealand Population Review*, 28(1), 99-128.
- Liebkind, K. (1996). Acculturation and stress: Vietnamese refugees in Finland. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27(2), 161-180.
- Littlejohn, S. (2002). *Theories of human communication* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Littlejohn, S., & Foss, K. (2005). *Theories of human communication* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Liu, J., McCreanor, T., McIntosh, T., & Teaiwa, T. (2005). *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Liu, J., Wilson, M., McClure, J., & Higgins, T. R. (1999). Social identity and the perception of history: Cultural representations of Aotearoa/New Zealand. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 1021-1047.
- Lu, L., & Kao, S. F. (2002). Traditional and modern characteristics across the generations: Similarities and discrepancies. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(1), 45-59.
- Madden, R., & Young, S. (1993). *Women and men immigrating to Australia: Their characteristics and immigration decisions*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Markovic, M., & Manderson, L. (2000). Nowhere is as at home: Adjustment strategies of recent immigrant women from the former Yugoslav Republics in southeast Queensland. *Journal of Sociology*, 36(3), 315-327.

- Martin, J. N., Nakayama, T. K., & Flores, L. A. (1998). A dialectical approach to intercultural communication. In J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in cultural contexts* (pp. 5-14). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Massey, D., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, E. (2006). Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal. In A. Messina & G. Lahav (Eds.), *The migration reader: Exploring politics and policies* (pp. 34-62). Boulder, CA: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Masters, C. (2004, February 28). Cultures entwined in history of respect. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- Matthewman, S. (2001). The weather climate: Our weather culture. In C. Bell (Ed.), *Sociology of everyday life in New Zealand* (pp. 13-29). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- McCombs, M. (2004). *Setting the agenda*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- McCombs, M., & Shaw, D. (1972). The agenda-setting function of the mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36, 176-187. Retrieved January, 19, 2007, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- McCreanor, T. (2005). 'Sticks and stones may break my bones ...': Talking Pakeha identities. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 52-68). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- McCrone, D. (2005). *Young people and labour mobility: Summary of findings*. Retrieved March 13, 2006, from The Institute of Governance, University of Edinburgh Web Site: [http://www.institute-of-governance.org/forum/Leverhulme/summaries/yp\\_mobility\\_summary.html](http://www.institute-of-governance.org/forum/Leverhulme/summaries/yp_mobility_summary.html)
- McDaniel, E. H., Samovar, L., & Porter, R. E. (2006). Understanding intercultural communication: An overview. In L. Samovar, R. E. Porter & E. R. McDaniel (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 6-16). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- McIntosh, T. (2005). Maori identities: Fixed, fluid, forced. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 38-51). Wellington: Victoria University Press.

- McKinnon, B. (Ed.). (1997). *New Zealand historical atlas: Ko papatuanuku e takato nei*. Auckland: David Bateman.
- McLauchlan, G. (1976). *The passionless people*. Auckland: Cassell.
- McLean, D. (2001). Australia and New Zealand: Two hearts not beating as one. *New Zealand International Review*, January/February, 2-5.
- McLean, D. (2003). *The prickly pair: Making nationalism in Australia and New Zealand*. Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago Press.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Mead, H. (2003). *Tikanga Maori: Living by Maori values*. Wellington: Huia.
- Metge, J. (1964). *New Maori migration: Rural and urban relations in New Zealand*. London: Athlone.
- Metge, J., & Kinloch, P. (1978). *Talking past each other: Problems of cross cultural communication*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Migration Watch UK. (2004). *Migration into Scotland*. Retrieved August 23, 2006, from [www.migrationwatch.org/pdfs/Other/10\\_3\\_MigrationintoScotland.pdf](http://www.migrationwatch.org/pdfs/Other/10_3_MigrationintoScotland.pdf)
- Min, E. J. (2001). Bakhtinian perspectives for the study of intercultural communication. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 22(1), 5-18.
- Ministry for the Environment. (2001). *Valuing New Zealand's clean green image*. Retrieved July 20, 2006, from <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/susdev/clean-green-image-value-aug01/index.htm>
- Mitchell, A. (1972). *The half-gallon quarter acre pavlova paradise*. Christchurch, NZ: Whitcombe & Tombs.
- Moldofsky, L. (2001). Friends, not family: It's time for a new maturity in the trans-Tasman relationship. *Time International*, 157(17), 16.
- Moran, A., Nancarrow, S., & Butler, A. (2005). "There's no place like home": A pilot study of perspectives of international health and social care professionals working in the UK. *Australia and New Zealand Health Policy*, 2(25).
- Mouly, S., & Sankaran, J. (2000). *The tall poppy syndrome in New Zealand: An exploratory investigation*. Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Conference of the International Association of Insight and Action, September, Brisbane, Australia.

- Mouly, S., & Sankaran, J. (2002). The enactment of envy within organizations: Insights from a New Zealand academic department. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 38(1), 36-56.
- Mueller, R. E. (1999). Changes in the quality of immigrant flows between the United States and Canada in the 1980s. *The American Review of Canadian Studies*, 621-649.
- Murray, D. (2000). *Haka* fracas? The dialectics of identity in discussions of a contemporary Maori dance. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 11(3), 345-357.
- National Health and Medical Research Council. (2003). *Values and ethics: Guidelines for ethical conduct in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health research*. Retrieved February 4, 2005, from [www.nhmrc.gov.au](http://www.nhmrc.gov.au)
- Nesdale, D., & Mak, A. S. (2003). Ethnic identification, self-esteem and immigrant psychological health. *International Journal in Intercultural Relations*, 27, 23-40.
- New Zealand Herald. (2005, April 11). *Maori party woos votes across the ditch*. Retrieved May 11, 2005, from <http://www.nzherald.co.nz>
- New Zealand Herald. (2005, August 11). *Tiptoeing in a nuclear minefield*. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- New Zealand Herald. (2006, May 13). *Budgeting to beat the brain drain*. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- New Zealand History Online. (2006). *Race Relations Day, 21 March 2005*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/classroom/event-racerelationsday>
- New Zealand Tourism Online. (2006). *Wineries and dining New Zealand*. Retrieved July 20, 2006, from <http://www.tourism.net.nz/wineries-new-zealand.html>
- Oberg, K. (1960). Cultural shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology*, 7, 177-182.
- Office of Treaty Settlements. (2006). *Quarterley Report to 30 June 2006*. Retrieved September 18, 2006, from <http://www.ots.govt.nz>
- O'Grady, S., & Larne, H. W. (1996). The psychic distance paradox. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(2), 309-333.

- Oliver, J. (2001). *Young people on being British and European: Some Scottish identities*. Sheffield University, Online Papers in Social Research. Retrieved May 31, 2005, from <http://www.shef.ac.uk/spcst/Shopoliver.pdf>
- Oliver, J. (2002). *Young people and Gaelic in Scotland: Identity dynamics in a European region*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield.
- Olssen, E. (1991). Sharing a laugh. In M. King (Ed.), *Pakeha: The Quest for identity in New Zealand* (pp. 117-128). Auckland: Penguin.
- Orange, C. (1992). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Page, J. (2002). Is mateship a virtue? *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 37(2), 193-198.
- Parrado, E. A., Flippen, C. A., & McQuiston, C. (2005). Migration and relationship power among Mexican women. *Demography*, 42(2), 347-372.
- Patman, R. (2001). Globalisation and Trans-Tasman relations: Integration or divergence? *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 55(3), 389-402.
- Patterson, J. (1992). *Exploring Maori values*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pearce, W. B. (1994). *Interpersonal communication: Making social worlds*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Pearce, W. B. (1995). A sailing guide for social constructionists. In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), *Social approaches to communication* (pp. 88-113). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Pearson, D. (2004). Rethinking citizenship in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand* (pp. 303-314). Melbourne: Thomson/Dunmore Press.
- Pearson, D., & Sissons, J. (1997). Pakeha and never Pakeha. *Sites*, 35, 64-80.
- Penrod, J., Bray Preston, D., Cain, R., & Starks, M. (2003). A discussion of chain referral as a method of sampling hard-to-reach populations. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 14(2), 100-107.
- Perry, N. (1989). Cinderella and the silver mercedes: Popular culture and the construction of national identity. In D. Novitz & B. Willmott (Eds.), *Culture and identity in New Zealand* (pp. 123-141). Wellington: GP Books.

- Peszynski, K., & Thanasankit, T. (2002). *Exploring trust in B2C e-commerce: An exploratory study of Maori culture in New Zealand*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of European Conference on Information Systems, June 6-8, Gdnask, Poland.
- Peterson, R. A. (2001). *Constructing effective questionnaires*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pfeifer, D., & Love, M. (2004). *Leadership in Aotearoa New Zealand: A cross-cultural study*. PRism 2. Retrieved November 14, 2004, from <http://praxis.massey.ac.nz>
- Phillips, J. (1996a). *A man's country? The image of the Pakeha male* (Revised ed.). Auckland: Penguin.
- Phillips, J. (1996b). Our history, our selves: The historian and national identity. *New Zealand Journal of History*, 30(2), 107-123.
- Phillips, J. (2005). *The New Zealanders*. Te Ara Encyclopedia of New Zealand. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from <Http://www/teara/govt.nz/NewZealanders/NewZealandPeoples/TheNewZealanders/10/en>
- Phillips, T., & Smith, P. (2000). What is 'Australian'? Knowledge and attitudes among a gallery of contemporary Australians. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 35(2), 203-224.
- Phinney, J., G, H., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 493-510. Retrieved February 20, 2003, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Polyzoi, E. (1985). Reflective phenomenology: An alternative approach to the study of the immigrant experience. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 16(2), 47-72.
- Portes, A. (1989). Contemporary immigration: Theoretical perspectives on its determinants and modes of incorporation. *International Migration Review*, 23(3), 606-630. Retrieved April 20, 2006, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.
- Portes, A. (1997). Immigration theory for a new century: Some problems and opportunities [Special issue: Immigrant adaptation and native-borm responses in the making of Americans]. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 799-825. Retrieved June 21, 2006, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.



- Portes, A. (2003). Conclusion: Theoretical convergencies and empirical evidence in the study of immigrant transnationalism. *International Migration Review*, 37(3), 874-892. Retrieved August 20, 2004, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.
- Portes, A., & DeWind, J. (2004). A cross-Atlantic dialogue: The progress of research and theory in the study of international migration. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 828-851. Retrieved May 30, 2006, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E., & Landolt, P. (1999). The study of transnationalism: Pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 217-237.
- Power, M., R. (2003). Designing communication for diversity in a horizontal individualist culture. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 30(2), 1-14.
- Purdie, N. (2003). *Australian national identity: Adolescents' conceptions of what it means to be Australian*. Paper presented at the Australian Association of Educational Research and the New Zealand Association of Educational Research Joint International Conference.
- Rangihau, J. (1975). Being Maori. In M. King (Ed.), *Te au hurihuri: The world moves on* (pp. 221-233). Wellington: Hicks, Smith and Sons.
- Richardson, S., Miller-Lewis, L., Ngo, P., & Ilsley, D. (2002, August). *The settlement experiences of new migrants: A comparison of wave one of LSIA 1 and LSIA 2*. Report prepared for the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs. from [http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/pdf/settle\\_exp.pdf](http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/pdf/settle_exp.pdf)
- Rogler, L. (1994). International migrations: A framework for directing research. *The American Psychologist*, 49(8), 701-708.
- Rudmin, F., & Ahmadzadeh, V. (2002). Psychometric critique of acculturation psychology: The case of Iranian migrants in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 41-56.
- Ryan, L. (2003). Moving spaces and changing places: Irish women's memories of emigration to Britain in the 1930s. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(1), 67-82.

- Ryan, L. (2004). Family matters: (E)migration, familial networks and Irish women in Britain. *The Sociological Review*, 52(3), 351-370.
- Samovar, L., & Porter, R. (2000). Understanding intercultural communication: An introduction and overview. In L. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (9th ed., pp. 5-16). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Segal, U. A., Mayadas, N. S., & Elliot, D. (2006). A framework for immigration. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*, 4(1), 3-24.
- Shweder, R., A. (1991). *Thinking through cultures: Expeditions in cultural psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sibley, C., & Liu, J. (2004). Attitudes towards biculturalism in New Zealand: Social dominance and Pakeha attitudes towards the general principles and resource-specific aspects of bicultural policy. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33(2), 88-99.
- Sinclair, K. (1986). *Destiny apart: New Zealand's search for national identity*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H., C., Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29(3), 240-276.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous people*. Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago Press.
- Spoonley, P., Bedford, R., & Macpherson, C. (2003). Divided loyalties and fractured sovereignty: Transnationalism and the nation-state in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(1), 27-46.
- Spoonley, P., Macpherson, C., & Pearson, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic countours of New Zealand*. Melbourne: Thomson.
- Statistics Canada. (2000). *Brain drain and brain gain: The migration of knowledge workers into and out of Canada*. Retrieved March 13, 2006, from <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/000524/d000524a.htm>
- Statistics New Zealand. (2001). *2001 Census: People born overseas*. Retrieved February 11, 2003, from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/pasfull/pasfull.nsf>

- Statistics New Zealand. (2002a). *2001 Census of population and dwellings - About Census*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from [http://www2.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/web/prod\\_serv.nsf/htmldocs/2001+census+of+population+and+dwellings+-+about+census](http://www2.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/web/prod_serv.nsf/htmldocs/2001+census+of+population+and+dwellings+-+about+census)
- Statistics New Zealand. (2002b). *Census snapshot: Cultural diversity*. Retrieved July 12, 2006, from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/products-and-services/Articles/census-snpst-cult-diversity-Mar02.htm>
- Statistics New Zealand. (2006a). *Demographic trends (2005): Population change and structure*. Retrieved April 10, 2006, from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/analytical-reports/dem-trends-05/default.htm>
- Statistics New Zealand. (2006b). *External Migration December 2005 Year*. Retrieved July 20, 2006, from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/tables/tourism-migration-2005.htm>
- Statistics New Zealand. (2006c). *New Zealand in profile*. Retrieved July 19, 2006, from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/products-and-services/new-zealand-in-profile-2006/General.htm>
- Stevenson, A. (2005, March 10). Now NZ wants its Kiwis back. *Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved March 11, 2005, from <http://smh.com.au>
- Stewart, C., & Harvey, C. (2003, July 26-27). What New Zealanders really think of Australia - loathe thy neighbour. *The Australian*, pp. 12-17.
- Stimson, R., & Minnery, J. (1998). Why people move to the 'sun-belt': A case study of long-distance migration to the Gold Coast, Australia. *Urban Studies*, 35(2), 193-114.
- Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Tajfel, H. (1982a). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *American Review of Psychology*, 33, 1-39.
- Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1982b). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tappe, A. (Ed.). (2002). *Using Nvivo in qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Melbourne: QSR International.
- Tartakovsky, E., & Schwartz, S. (2001). Motivation for emigration, values, wellbeing, and identification among young Russian Jews. *International Journal of Psychology*, 36(2), 88-99.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Taylor, K. (2005, November 2). Expats called home to 'fizzing and buzzing' NZ. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved November 2, 2005, from <http://www.nzherald.co.nz>
- Taylor, R. (1969). Migration and motivation: A study of determinants and types. In J. A. Jackson (Ed.), *Migration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, S. (1996). *Constructions of national identity and the nation: The case of New Zealand/Aotearoa*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Open University, London.
- Taylor, S., & Wetherell, M. (1995). Doing national construction work: Discourses of national identity. *Sites*, 30, 69-84.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2004). *Fact Sheet 20: Maori in Australia*. Retrieved May 5, 2006, from <http://www.tpk.govt.nz/publications/factsheets/default.asp>
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2006). *Nga Maori ki Ahitereiria 2006: Maori in Australia 2006*. Retrieved March 28, 2006, from <http://www.tpk.govt.nz/surveys/australia/>
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2003). Major issues and controversies in the use of mixed methods in the social and behavioral sciences. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 3-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- The University of Waikato. (2006). *Settlement and circulation of New Zealanders living in Australia*. The University of Waikato. Retrieved May 9, 2006, from <http://www.waikato.ac.nz/wfass/migration/project-nz-aus-steelement.shtml>

- Thomas, W. I., & Znaniecki, F. (1927). *The Polish peasant in Europe and America*. New York: Knopf.
- Tilbury, F. (1999). *"Some of my best friends are Maori but...": Cross-ethnic friendships, ethnic identity and attitudes to race relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Victoria University, Wellington.
- Tilbury, F. (2001). Haunting traces of difference: Derrida and Kiwi identity. In L. Simmons & H. Worth (Eds.), *Derrida downunder* (pp. 198-215). Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Y. Kim & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 213-235). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (2000). Managing intercultural conflicts effectively. In L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (9th ed., pp. 388-399). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Ting-Toomey, S., Yee-Jung, K. K., Shapiro, R. B., Garcia, W., Wright, T. J., & Oetzel, J. (2000). Ethnic/cultural identity salience and conflict styles in four US ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(1), 47-81.
- Triandis, H., C. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H., C. (2001). Individualism and collectivism: Past, present, and future. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *The handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 35-50). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Triandis, H., C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M., J., Asaia, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(2), 323-338.
- Triandis, H., C., & Suh, E., M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 133-160.
- Turner, G. (1994). *Making it national: Nationalism and Australian popular culture*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Van Hiel, A., & Mervielde, I. (2002). Social identification among political party voters and members: An empirical test of optimal distinctiveness theory. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(2), 202-209.

- Vertovec, S. (2001). Transnationalism and identity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4), 573-582.
- Vertovec, S. (2003). Migration and other modes of transnationalism: Towards conceptual cross-fertilization. *International Migration Review*, 37(3), 641-665. Retrieved August 20, 2004, from the Info Trac Expanded Academic database.
- Vignoles, V., Chryssochoou, X., & Breakwell, G. (2000). The distinctiveness principle: Identity, meaning, and the bounds of cultural relativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(4), 337-354.
- Von Reichert, C. (2001). Returning and new Montana migrants: Socio-economic and motivational differences. *Growth and Change*, 32(Fall 2001), 447-465.
- Voronov, M., & Singer, J. A. (2002). The myth of individualism-collectivism: A critical review. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(4), 461-480.
- Waitangi Tribunal. (2006). *Waitangi Tribunal: Background*. Retrieved September 18, 2006, from <http://www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz/about/established.asp>
- Waldinger, R., & Fitzgerald, D. (2004). Transnationalism in question. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(5), 1177-1195.
- Walker, R. (1987). *Nga tau tohetohe: Years of anger*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Walker, R. (1989). Maori identity. In D. Novitz & B. Willmott (Eds.), *Culture and identity in New Zealand* (pp. 35-52). Wellington: GP Books.
- Walker, U. (2001). *A question of ethnicity-one word, different people, many perceptions: The perspectives of groups other than Maori, Pacific peoples, and New Zealand Europeans*. Statistics New Zealand. Retrieved May 4, 2005, from [http://www.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/web/prod\\_serv.nsf/874ea91c142289384c2567a80081308e/39ad6cadd252687bcc2\\$FILE/ethnicity\\_other\\_main.pdf](http://www.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/web/prod_serv.nsf/874ea91c142289384c2567a80081308e/39ad6cadd252687bcc2$FILE/ethnicity_other_main.pdf)
- Waters, J. (2003). Flexible citizens? Transnationalism and citizenship among economic immigrants in Vancouver. *The Canadian Geographer*, 47(3), 219-234. Retrieved October 30, 2004, from the Ebsco Academic Search Premier database.
- Watkins, T. (2006, May 15). Who's on the ropes? *Dominion Post*. Retrieved May 25, 2006, from the Factiva database.

- Webster, A., & Perry, P. (2003). *The New Zealand study of values (A member-project of the World Values Survey, Massey University)*. Paper presented at the Forum of The New Zealand Futures Trust, August 27, Wellington, NZ.
- Webster, S. (1993). Postmodernist theory and the sublimation of Maori culture. *Oceania*, 63(3), 222-239.
- Weir, J. (2006, May 11). Big Australian tax cuts may lure more Kiwis. *The Press*. Retrieved May 12, 2006, from the Factiva database.
- White, P. (2003). Not just rugby clubs: Scottish and Welsh-born migrants in London. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 119(3), 209-227.
- White, R. (1981). *Inventing Australia: Images and identity 1688-1980*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1995). In defence of Australian culture. *Quadrant*, 39(11), 17-22.
- Wiley, K. (1988). A hard dry humour for a hard dry land. In V. Burgmann & J. Lee (Eds.), *Constructing a culture: A people's history of Australia since 1788* (pp. 156-169). Melbourne: McPhee Gribble.
- Williams, M. (1996). Immigrants and indigenes. *Meanjin*, 55(4), 635-650.
- Willmott, B. (1989). Introduction: Culture and national identity. In D. Novitz & B. Willmott (Eds.), *Culture and identity in New Zealand* (pp. 1-20). Wellington: GP Books.
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2006). *Mass media research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Wood, J. (2001). The movement of people. In B. Brown (Ed.), *New Zealand and Australia: Where are we going?* (pp. 81-86). Wellington: The New Zealand Institute of International Affairs.
- World Vision Australia. (2006). *Asia tsunami disaster: World vision's response*. Retrieved 23 February, 2007, from <http://www.worldvision.com.au/appeals/tsunami/>
- Yeoh, B., S., Willis, K., D., & Khader Fakhri, A., S.M. (2003). Transnational edges. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 26(2), 207-217.
- Zodgekar, A. (1990). British emigrants to New Zealand: Their motives and expectations. *International Migration*, 28, 417-441.

Zodgekar, A. (2005). The changing face of New Zealand's population and national identity. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 140-154). Wellington: Victoria University Press.

#### **Publications by the Candidate Relevant to the Thesis**

Green, A.E., & Power, M.R. (2006). Defining transnationalism boundaries: New Zealand migrants in Australia. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 33(1), 35-52.

#### **Manuscript Submitted for Publication**

Green, A.E., & Power, M.R. (2006). *Trans-Tasman migration: New Zealanders' explanations for their move*. Manuscript submitted for publication to the New Zealand Geographer.

#### **Conference Presentations Relevant to the Thesis**

Green, A.E., & Power, M.R. (2004). *Coming, going, and staying: New Zealanders continue their journey*. Paper presented at Australian and New Zealand Communication Association Conference, University of Sydney, July 7-9.

Green, A.E., & Power, M.R. (2005). *Social construction of transnational identity*. Paper presented at Australian and New Zealand Communication Association Conference, Christchurch, New Zealand, July 4-7.

Green, A.E., & Power, M.R. (2006). *Contrasting definitions of self of migrants and stayers*. Paper presented at Australian and New Zealand Communication Association Conference, University of Adelaide, 5-7 July.